DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 695 HE 010 996

TITLE	An Uncertain Future. Review, 1975-76 to 1977-78.
INSTITUTION	Council of Ontario Universities, Toronto.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	62p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Ontario Universities, 130 St. George St., Suite 8039, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2T4, Canada
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Admission; *College Cooperation; *College Planning; College Role; Consortia; Cooperative Programs; Declining Enrollment; Educational Assessment; Educational Coordination; Educational Finance; Educational Planning; Financial Problems; *Foreign Countries; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; Library Cooperation; Needs Assessment; Organizations (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; *Council of Ontario Universities; *Ontario

ABSTRACT

The development of the Ontario university system from 1975-76 to 1977-78 is traced, with focus on the deteriorating financial situation of the past few years and the impact of recently declining enrollments. The growth of cooperative activities among the universities has included the planning of graduate programs, library cataloging, instructional development, and admissions. The current state of the Ontario universities and future prospects bring to discussion uncertainty over finances, enrollment, staffing, the adequacy of structures for planning, and the role of universities in general. In addition to the decline in the overall level of funding relative to costs, there have been important changes in the distribution of the funds among the different institutions. The changes have been brought about mainly by modifications in the formula distribution mechanism but also, to a lesser extent, by changes in the system of nonformula grants. Tuition fees are involved also. Developments in graduate level planning in Ontario are discussed to illustrate and define in part the pros and cons of cooperative planning and voluntary association of the autonomous universities. Background information about the membership, constitution, committees and affiliates, financial statements, and a list of publications of the Council of Ontario Universities are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ISBN O-88799-107-6
ISSN 0315-9590

Council of Ontario Universities

review 1975-76 to 1977-78

Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario

ED165695

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council of Ontario Universities
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE010996

an uncertain future

130 St. George Street, Suite 8039, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2T4
78-17

Contents

1. Emerging Concerns/1
The Worsening Financial Environment/1
The Changing Enrolment Picture/3
Further Financial Changes/4
Modifying the Operating Grants Formula/5
Non-formula Grants/6
The Supplementary Grant/6
The Northern Ontario Grant/7
The Bilingual Grant/8
The Moratorium on Capital Grants/8

2. The Graduate Studies Enterprise/10

3. University Cooperative Activities/17
Coordination of Applications for Admission/17
Computer Coordination/18
Teaching and Learning: The Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development/19
University Library Cooperation/21
Union Catalogue Projects/22
UNICAT/TELECAT (Union Catalogue/Télécatalogage)/22
MEDICAT (Medical Catalogues)/23
CODOC (Cooperative Government Documents Project)/23
CUSS (Cooperative Union Serials System)/23
MAPS Project (Union List of Maps)/24
Resource Sharing Projects/24
Interlibrary Lending and Borrowing/24
Interuniversity Transit System/25
Collection Development and Rationalization/25
The Benefits of Library Coordination/26

4. An Uncertain Future/28
The Financial Future/28
Tuition Fees and Student Aid/29
Staffing the Universities/31
Burgeoning Nationalism/33
The Structure of the System/35
Planning the Future/36

Appendices
A Members, Executive, Secretariat/40
B Constitution/42
C Committees, Boards and Affiliates/45
D Financial Statements/53
E Publications/55

Chapter 1

Emerging Concerns

The changes in the Ontario university system during the past three years have not been as dramatic as those which marked some earlier periods. But the Ontario universities at the end of the academic year 1977-78 were decidedly not the same as they were three years earlier, nor were they facing the same future. How the environment has changed is the substance of this brief historical account. Some reflections on the implications of these changes both for the individual institutions and for the university collectivity in Ontario are to be found in the final chapter. The picture painted here contains a mixture of muted and subtly shifting colours; it is not a canvas of sharp colours and stark contrasts. Still, it is dominated by two themes: finances and enrolment. The climate of financial austerity has carried over from the earlier triennium but it is now chillier and of expected longer duration. The well-being of the system is now further threatened by the consequences of an unexpectedly early decline in enrolment.

The Worsening Financial Environment

By 1975, it was clear that the financial environment of Ontario's universities had undergone a dramatic change. Funding was continuing to rise as enrolments increased, but, with the perverse effects of inflation, the system was being expected to do more for less. An index prepared by the Ontario Council on University Affairs has subsequently shown that, after correction for inflation, the per student income of the Ontario universities in 1974-75 was only 85% of the level five years earlier.[1] OCUA highlighted the situation in its funding advice to government issued in November 1975, by asserting that the Ontario university system was in trouble, beset by two socio-economic circumstances over which it had little if any control: inflation and a demand boom for services in the form of accelerating enrolment growth. Although the government continued to adhere to its policy of university accessibility, in effect it was reducing the level of per student public funding while constraining tuition fee increases to less than the rate of inflation. Thus the universities were caught in a classic 'cost-price squeeze.'

When announcing the level of operating grant support for the universities for the academic year 1975-76, the Minister issued a statement on funding objectives. The global amount of the operating grants to the universities for that year

[1]Ontario Council on University Affairs, ***Fourth Annual Report,*** 1977-78 (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1978).

was "sufficient to offset inflationary trends, to maintain and improve existing levels of service, and to accommodate predicted enrolment increases." This was a clear statement to be sure, but its accuracy was challenged both by COU and OCUA. Each was firmly persuaded that the sum provided by the government for operating grants in 1975-76 was insufficient to meet this three-fold objective; each said so.

OCUA modified these objectives when it provided advice to the government for 1976-77. In deference to economic realities, OCUA discarded as impractical the objective of improving existing levels of service. But a fourth objective was added: the maintenance of financial viability in the university system. In working out the cost implications of meeting these objectives, OCUA developed a model to estimate the impact of inflation and enrolment variation on the financial requirements of the system. The model introduced, however, two new factors into the calculation. The first of these, an 'excess capacity factor,' was based on OCUA's conclusion that the projected undergraduate enrolment increase in the system could be accommodated at a marginal cost. This produced a recommendation that a 50% discount be applied to the provision for enrolment growth. Although COU subsequently made representations about the specific value of the discount, it did not question the fundamental principle of marginal costing. Considerable concern was expressed, however, regarding OCUA's second discount factor, the 'efficiency factor,' which was used to effect a further 1.5% reduction in the funding requirements. COU questioned and continues to question the appropriateness of what is essentially a 'productivity' discount being applied to the university sector. From its perspective, apparent increases in productivity may well be characterized as decreases in quality. Thus the level of funding recommended by OCUA for 1976-77 (which was closely followed by the government) was judged by COU not to be sufficient to meet the stated objectives.

As a result of this inadequate funding level, COU noted that the universities were establishing their operating budget priorities in the following order: 1) to offset inflationary trends in salaries and wages; 2) to accommodate enrolment increases; 3) to maintain financial viability; and, 4) to maintain their non-human resources. The universities were maintaining accessibility and providing services without running deficits, but they were doing so by 'consuming their capital,' that is, by running down their resource base, particularly non-human resources. This could not be expected to continue much longer without a substantial decline in quality.

As one of its contributions to the on-going debate over the adequacy of public funding for Ontario universities, COU published data on provincial expenditures on university education. While showing that Ontario spent more in total dollars on higher education than other provincial jurisdictions (it had the largest university system), these comparisons also showed that the level of operating support in Ontario, expressed in terms of dollars per full time student, had decreased dramatically during the early '70s. By 1974-75, the Province ranked seventh in Canada. Data for subsequent years show that by 1977 On-

tario had fallen to eighth place among the provinces, almost $900 per full time equivalent student (nearly 20%) below the rest of Canada.

The same basic pattern of government funding was repeated in 1977-78, leading to a further erosion in the purchasing power of the university dollar. Tuition fees were increased by $100 per annum but the additional revenue thus generated was used to offset what otherwise would have been required in grant revenue.

In 1978, a more serious deterioration occurred when the government's decision on funding fell significantly short of the recommendation of its own advisory body. Despite downward recalculation due to a decrease in enrolment, the sum provided by the government involved a shortfall of almost $15 million with respect to OCUA's advice and over $30 million with respect to what COU had judged as the minimum requirements of the system. In making the announcement, the Minister stressed the general situation of financial restraint facing the Province and argued limitations on the government's ability to pay. He noted further that the universities were being treated as generously as other sectors, more generously than some, and he expressed his conviction that this amount was sufficient for the needs of the universities. There was no mention of government funding objectives for the universities. All sectors, including the universities, were to be restrained as part of the government's over-all policy of financial restraint.

The universities were now under extreme financial pressure. Moreover, by this time they were also facing unexpected declines in enrolment.

The Changing Enrolment Picture

Until 1977-78, enrolment in Ontario universities had risen annually since the early 1950s. The explosive expansion that marked the '60s slowed in the first half of the current decade; nonetheless, between 1970-71 and 1975-76 the annual growth in full time equivalent enrolment averaged 5.6%. There was recognition, of course, that demographic factors would likely soon produce a decline in enrolment. The population bulge caused by the post World War II baby boom and the immigration wave of the late '50s and '60s would be gone by the early '80s and this would produce a sharp decline in the size of the 18-24 age cohort, the group from which four-fifths of university students have traditionally been drawn. This decline would plateau near the end of the century unless some new factors entered to affect the demography. Everyone connected with the hazardous task of projecting university enrolment was careful to point out the risks and the uncertainties due to the numerous complex variables involved. The demography and the participation rate were the two principal factors, but these could be affected by a host of other factors: the economic environment; the behaviour of the university system; and policies at the different levels of government, including financing, taxing, immigration, etc. Notwithstanding the uncertainties, however, all projections were for continued increases in enrolment in Ontario universities until the early 1980s.

Thus, although the long term future seemed clearly to indicate a decline in

enrolment, the short term problem was how to handle the continuing increase. If the policy of accessibility was to be maintained, some provision would need to be made for the increase, while avoiding the building of too much into the base which would then have to be reduced when the period of decline arrived. Using available demographic data and various assumptions concerning participation rates, in 1976 and 1977 both COU and OCUA engaged in enrolment projection exercises, showing alternative models. All of these models displayed a continuing annual increase in enrolment through 1982-83.

Less than a year later the unexpected happened. Instead of rising as projected, full time undergraduate enrolment in 1977-78 fell by 2.8%, resulting in total enrolment approximately 1% below the level two years earlier. This decline, caused by a combination of fewer Grade XIII graduates going on to university and a number of students already enrolled in the system deciding to discontinue their studies, produced a decline in the participation rate which, having reached a high of 13% of the 18-24 age group in 1975-76, now fell to approximately 12.5%. In 1978-79, there was a further decline. Preliminary data show a drop of about 2.5% caused again by a reduction in the participation rate, which is now down to under 12%.

The causes of this decline in the participation rate are now the subject of much study, since they will likely hold the key to answering the question of whether this decline is to be of shorter or longer duration, a matter of major significance to Ontario's university system. There is evidence that the decline is related to the present uncertain economic climate and the high rate of unemployment among young people. The decline in popularity of universities is marked by an increase in popularity of the colleges of applied arts and technology, which are seen to be more vocationally oriented. And there is a sharp increase in interest in professionally and vocationally oriented programmes at every level, in contrast with the liberal arts and science programmes. Indeed, the decline in undergraduate enrolment is almost entirely due to the decline in enrolment in arts and science, where traditionally more than half the undergraduate student body has been located. Some of the implications of this new enrolment picture are examined in the final chapter.

Further Financial Changes

Although the primary issue in university financing for the period under review was the decline in the overall level of funding relative to costs, no account of the financing of Ontario universities would be complete without some mention of the important changes in the distribution of these funds among the different institutions. These changes have been brought about principally by modifications in the formula distribution mechanism but also, to a lesser extent, by changes in the system of non-formula grants. Tuition fees are involved as well, but because this is a matter about which future prospects are uncertain, it has been left for treatment in the final chapter which looks to the future.

Modifying the Operating Grants Formula

It is well known that Ontario universities receive their operating grants on the basis of an enrolment-based formula. What is much less well known is that in recent years there have been major modifications in how the formula is applied, in order to make it much less sensitive to changes in enrolment. When the operating grants formula was first introduced in 1966, it was a purely enrolment-driven formula. The operating grants were distributed annually to each university on the basis of current enrolment weighted according to the various programme weights. When the formula was first instituted, enrolment was climbing rapidly and funds were readily available to meet the increasing costs. As a result, government funding was in one sense open-ended. The value of the Basic Income Unit, the amount of the government grant for each full time student in a programme accorded a formula weight of 1, was established annually and the amount of the global government grant established by a simple multiplication, the total number of BIUs multiplied by the value of the BIU. (In this chapter we deal only with changes to the undergraduate funding formula; modifications in the graduate formula are treated in Chapter 2.)

By the early '70s, however, as a result of the rapidly rising costs to fund the expanding universities, much more attention began to be paid to the total, the global sum. Decisions on the value of the BIU began to be affected more by the total sum judged by government to be available for spending on universities than by the 'unit costs' to the universities of educating ever larger numbers of students. This caused a shift in the use of the formula. Originated as a mechanism for establishing both the size of the global sum and the distribution of this sum among the universities, the formula now became primarily a mechanism for distribution. Concurrently, there was concern that a purely enrolment-driven formula was causing some universities consciously to expand enrolment unduly in order to increase their revenue. Thus, moves were made to modify the operating grants formula in order to reduce its sensitivity to enrolment shifts. The first steps took place during the period in which enrolment was continuing to rise; the current significance of the changes is in terms of the enrolment decline.

In 1975, OCUA analyzed the implications of maintaining the government's policy of accessibility to post-secondary education, a policy of providing places for all qualified applicants to some academic programme in the Province (though not necessarily to the programme or even the institution of the student's first choice). OCUA noted that this important policy contained two essential implications: there should be some funding provided for enrolment growth; and there should be clear recognition of the obligation to maintain some degree of financial stabilization in order to protect the educational investment through a period of enrolment decline following a period of growth. This latter was judged, quite correctly, to be of critical importance both for the stability of the university system taken as a whole and for the maintenance of equity among the individual institutions.

In order to implement the stabilization principle, OCUA undertook a phased process to reduce the sensitivity of funding to enrolment shifts. The first stage was the introduction of enrolment averaging. By 1977-78, enrolments averaged over a three year period were being used to calculate formula income. The second new element was the discounting by 50% of the difference between a rolling three year average and a fixed historical base (also a three year average, covering the years 1974-75 to 1976-77). This change introduced a symmetry between the calculation of system funding and interinstitutional distribution. The effect of these alterations to the funding base is that for 1978-79 the universities are receiving 50% of their funding on the historical base and 50% on the rolling average.

As a result of these successive modifications in the distribution mechanism, the Ontario universities undergraduate operating grants formula is now relatively insensitive to annual shifts in enrolment. As such it provides no great incentive for institutions to seek to expand their enrolment since the increases in revenue derived therefrom are likely to be judged insufficient to cover the added resources necessary to cope adequately with the increased numbers of students. At the same time, the new system protects institutional revenue from sharp enrolment declines, cushioning the negative effect by spreading it out over a period of time. Thus in a period of enrolment decline, such as the universities now appear to have entered, the formula provides institutions facing long term enrolment declines with an opportunity to adjust (downwards) their programme and expenditure commitments consistent with reduced revenues. COU has supported these modifications and is basically satisfied with their effect.

The development of this mechanism has greatly reduced the pressure to modify the formula weights, and has somewhat muffled the general criticism of an enrolment-driven formula for operating grants. However, it has not resolved the problems of institutions which might suffer such a serious decline in enrolment that they no longer receive sufficient public monies to enable them to maintain the range of academic programmes they have developed. Whether the present or any operating grants formula can effectively deal with such a situation is an issue which now faces the Ontario universities and the government.

Non-formula Grants

The period under review has seen several important developments in non-formula grants, developments of somewhat minor importance to the collectivity taken as a whole but of considerable significance to the individual institutions concerned. At the beginning of the period two types of non-formula grants were provided: Supplementary and Bilingual Grants. During the period a third was added, the Northern Grant.

The Supplementary Grant

The Supplementary Grant has had a checkered history and remains a matter of some controversy within the collectivity. Begun as an Emergent Grant pro-

vided to the new, small universities to assist them in the development period during which they were not financially viable on the operating grants formula, this grant was subsequently renamed and broadened in concept. In 1975-76, seven universities were receiving additional funding by means of this Supplementary Grant, including three which had not initially received the Emergent Grant. But OCUA, which indicated that it had been unable to develop an adequate rationale for such grants to Carleton, Windsor and York, then recommended the discontinuation of special funding to these institutions and a policy of gradual reduction in the Supplementary Grants to the remaining four, Brock, Trent, Lakehead and Laurentian. Brock received a small terminal grant in 1976-77. Grants for the remaining three have been reduced annually since that time.

In reaching its decision to recommend phasing out the Supplementary Grant, OCUA recognized that size was a relevant criterion and referred to an enrolment threshold at which each university receiving the Supplementary Grant should be able to manage without such support. OCUA also spoke, however, of claims for special funding based on elusive grounds and of the need for all institutions in a system which was moving into a period of total enrolment decline and already in a period of restricted public funding to learn to live on ordinary resources, without supplementary support. In its May 1977 brief to OCUA, COU reaffirmed the position, taken from the time of the earliest discussions of the issue, that size, not time, is the principal factor in determining the point at which small universities are able to survive on formula funds alone. It noted that the decision of OCUA to phase out the Supplementary Grant represented a contradiction of its earlier acceptance of the principle that such grants are based on the reasonable (if not precisely verifiable) assumption that enrolment-based formulas do not recognize that there are minimum fixed costs below which a university simply cannot operate as such. Noting further that modifications in the enrolment formula were causing reductions in income related to enrolment growth and that the total value of the Supplementary Grants represented less than 1% of the operating funds being provided to the system, COU requested a joint study of the matter in order to determine the appropriate level of supplementary support for the smaller institutions.

OCUA was unresponsive to this request and the level of the Supplementary Grants was again cut for 1978-79. By this time, however, the decline in enrolment had begun and this added further pressures to the smaller institutions which are more exposed when competition for enrolment increases. In its Spring 1978 brief to OCUA, COU noted that in the absence of further study the recommendation to continue reduction in the Supplementary Grants appeared arbitrary, and again urged joint study of the matter. Here the matter still rests.

The Northern Ontario Grant

Concurrent with its review of the Supplementary Grant in 1975, OCUA undertook an examination of the extra costs incurred by the two Ontario univer-

sities located in the north of the Province, Lakehead and Laurentian. As a result, OCUA recommended and the Ministry accepted the establishment of a new category of extra-formula operating grant, the Northern Ontario Grant. This grant, provided to Lakehead and Laurentian, and to the three affiliates of Laurentian (Algoma, Hearst and Nipissing) was established to assist in meeting the additional direct costs both of operating a university in a northern environment and of maintaining a minimum range of academic programmes in a geographically vast area with a small population. After an initial year in which the size of the grants was established on an ad hoc basis, the Northern Ontario Grant has now been established on a continuing basis under a mini-formula which provides additional funds equivalent to 11% of the Basic Operating Income. This grant was welcomed by the recipients and supported by their sister institutions and by COU.

The Bilingual Grant

Established to assist those institutions with a formal commitment to provide academic programmes and services in both official languages, the Bilingual Grant has always lacked a clear rationale on which its size could be determined. OCUA acknowledged this in 1974, observing that the grant amounts awarded from year to year in the past had followed no discernible pattern, and noting that the history shows inconclusive attempts to establish reasonably clear grounds on which to base the level and distribution of this grant. The Advisory Council on Franco-Ontarian Affairs was asked to provide advice but, pending the results, interim grants were awarded in 1975-76 and similar ad hoc grants were awarded in 1976-77 and in 1977-78. During 1977, OCUA with the cooperation of the institutions involved completed a study of the incremental costs of bilingualism which resulted in recommendations to establish a new level of bilingual funding. Having determined by means of the study that the costs of bilingualism in 1976-77 amounted to $5.515 million, a sum that exceeded by $1.67 million the total grant for that year, OCUA recommended an additional $1 million grant in 1978-79. This increased grant is to provide the basis for allocations for a period of four to six years, after which the costs of bilingualism are to be reviewed again to determine the appropriate level and distribution of grants for a subsequent period. Having supported the judgment that bilingualism in Ontario universities should be better supported, COU has expressed its agreement with the position of OCUA and has added its voice to urge that further funds be made available from outside the present global amount. The Report of a COU Special Committee on the Support of Bilingualism in Ontario universities detailing these concerns was approved by Council in the fall of 1977.

The Moratorium on Capital Grants

Although the period of large scale physical expansion in the Ontario university system is now behind us, no account of financing Ontario universities, however brief, would be complete without at least a footnote on capital financing.

During the '60s the government had provided ad hoc capital grants to the universities for selected building projects whose costs were underwritten by private funds. Gradually a full-fledged policy of capital support was developed according to which the government paid the full costs of capital projects on the basis of a formula of institutional 'entitlement.' In 1972, this policy was suspended by the imposition of a near moratorium on capital grants. Three years later this moratorium was described as a policy vacuum by OCUA, which undertook the development of a new policy in the capital realm. As a temporary measure, that Council developed a recommendation on the level of support for cyclic renewal (assistance for major renovations and maintenance) which it described as an interim plateau. For 1977-78 the government continued the moratorium and only a portion of the amount recommended by OCUA for cyclic renewal "to protect the interim plateau" was provided. In the face of these realities, in 1977 OCUA abandoned its efforts to develop a new formula and simply recommended the exercise of ministerial discretion in the funding of building renovation, alteration and replacement projects on the basis of criteria laid down by OCUA. By 1978, a year later, with the apparent disappearance of the tail-end of the enrolment bulge, concern for providing additional space had disappeared and there was no more mention of any need for a new capital formula. COU, indeed, recommended that given the current financial restrictions, if a trade-off between operating and capital funding was necessary, priority should be given to operating grants over capital grants. OCUA recommended, and the government accepted, adoption of the COU *Building Blocks* space standards as the measure of comparative space needs. OCUA also recommended that both short term and long term rentals be made eligible for capital assistance at the discretion of the Minister according to criteria established by OCUA. Thus, after a long period, the standards developed by COU for university buildings have received official recognition. In the current circumstances, with no capital development in the system, this is of limited relevance. Nevertheless, it represents recognition of the ability of Ontario universities to develop common standards in this important area.

Chapter 2

The Graduate Studies Enterprise

The evolution of graduate studies in Ontario universities during the '60s and '70s is in many ways one of the most interesting and significant aspects of the recent history of higher education in the Province. It would be inaccurate as well as unfair to describe the general history of the university system primarily in terms of the history of graduate enterprise. However, it would not be entirely without foundation to suggest that much of the resources of the universities, including time and energy for instance, have been allocated to the graduate enterprise, and so many of the other aspects of life in the universities have been affected by the decisions and policies in the graduate field. Developments in graduate studies in Ontario serve to illustrate as well as to define in part the pros and cons of this Province's chosen way to deal with the complex and increasingly contentious issues of academic planning for a sophisticated, multi-institutional system. In no other area of university activity are the strengths and weaknesses of cooperative planning and voluntary association among a group of fifteen autonomous universities more apparent or more real.

As early as 1965, the need for the orderly development of graduate work in the Province was recognized and a commission established to advise on how best to proceed. This Commission, the Spinks Commission, identified two major objectives: improvement of academic quality, and avoidance of unnecessary duplication. It recommended the establishment of a single graduate University of Ontario as the only adequate means of providing the central authority necessary to achieve these ends. This recommendation was rejected out of hand both by the universities and by the government as inappropriate in the Ontario context. The needs for planning and coordination were recognized but the development of excellence and the effective utilization of resources was to be accomplished by voluntary action. This initiated a complex process of university self-evaluation and self-regulation that has continued to develop in scope and significance up to the present. It is based on two related activities: academic programme appraisal, which addresses quality consideration; and academic discipline assessment, which provides the perspective of system planning.

The appraisal process developed first, under the aegis of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (comprising the deans of graduate studies of COU member institutions). In 1967, OCGS established an Appraisals Committee and appropriate procedures to ensure a careful academic evaluation of all new graduate programmes. The discipline planning exercises came slightly later, in 1971, with the establishment of the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning

(ACAP) to guide the development of province-wide discipline groups and to coordinate the large task of rationalizing graduate studies in the Province. These twin exercises in voluntary cooperation were given considerable additional impetus in 1971, when the government announced that from henceforth the funding of new graduate programmes would require both that they had successfully passed appraisal (for quality) and that they were included in a discipline assessment (for planning). During the first half of the '70s the assessment machinery was put into place and the pace of graduate programme planning quickened. By the end of January 1976, a total of 197 graduate programmes, including 58 at the doctoral level, had undergone appraisal and 22 discipline planning assessments had been completed.

A further chapter in the development of graduate planning was added in 1975 by a decision of the Minister made on advice from OCUA. In its memorandum on graduate planning issued in June 1975, OCUA observed that, although there had been a number of significant positive accomplishments in the planning process to that date, one important dimension was still missing - consideration of the financial implications. OCUA acknowledged that COU had been engaged in a difficult and demanding process and commended the university community for the thoroughness with which graduate planning was being undertaken. It registered concern, though, that in a period in which resources for the entire university enterprise, both undergraduate and graduate, were becoming increasingly scarce, insufficient attention was being paid to the financial implications of decisions to proceed with new graduate programmes. OCUA stated that from henceforth it would review COU recommendations on the development of graduate programmes annually in a package and that its recommendations on funding for new programmes would be based not only on evidence of the need and desirability of these programmes, but also on information about their impact on the financial position of the entire university system. Later the same year, OCUA recommended the suspension of formula funding of graduate programmes for a period of at least two and possibly three years, beginning in 1976-77, in favour of institutional grants that would be totally insensitive to changes in enrolment levels. This recommendation was based on several considerations, including the need to ensure that future development in the graduate area did not take place at the expense of the financial viability of the university system as a whole, and the desirability of creating an environment in which institutions might undertake graduate planning freed from short term revenue considerations and the steering effect of the formula. The Minister accepted this advice and the graduate funding 'freeze' went into effect for the 1976-77 academic year. The universities were put on notice that the observed effects over time of the freeze would be a key to the longer run future of graduate programme planning and formula financing in the Province.

In its Spring 1976 brief to OCUA on graduate planning, COU recommended a new approach to graduate planning which would emphasize the improvement of academic quality by means of a strengthening of the appraisal process

and an earlier role for ACAP in the planning of new programmes. By this latter means, relevant system factors could be taken into account prior to institutional decisions to set resources in place. It also called for the establishment of clear, firm institutional priorities in this area. COU recommended that the planning/appraisal process should remain in place but be reinforced by the development of a clear statement of basic goals and objectives for graduate study in the system, after which more specific attention could be given to the design of the most suitable planning/appraisal process and an appropriate funding mechanism. To provide a period of reasonable stability for this revision process as well as a better data base upon which to assess the effects of the funding freeze, COU recommended that the freeze be extended for an additional (third) year.

The response of OCUA moved the process one further step. Noting that the five year record of relatively stable enrolment levels in graduate studies (which incidentally, masked steady increases in professional programmes such as the MBA and the MEd, matched by corresponding declines in the traditional core disciplines in the humanities and sciences) indicated that the size of the graduate enterprise was no longer the prime concern, OCUA emphasized that priority in graduate planning had now shifted to quality. OCUA applauded the recommendations of COU on the future directions of graduate planning and undertook to expand the dialogue on the subject by making two concrete suggestions. The first involved a quinquennial approach to graduate planning, the second the establishment of a series of statistical 'macro-indicators' intended to yield a general profile of graduate programmes and thereby assist both the institutions and the collectivity in planning.

With respect to the quinquennium, OCUA proposed that graduate planning in the Province be undertaken on a five year basis, beginning with the 1979-80 academic year. Planning for this period would reflect the major characteristic of the period, consolidation, and would embrace the following objectives:

1. The protection and enhancement of the quality of doctoral programmes;
2. The elimination or prevention of unnecessary duplication at all levels of graduate programming;
3. The necessity of ensuring adequate support for outstanding doctoral programmes (despite declines in enrolment); and
4. The development of new fields of study in which there is genuine need.

These objectives would be attained by the development of appropriately rigorous appraisal schemes and assessment mechanisms to ensure high quality in programmes and as much consistency as possible across disciplines.

In order to provide the necessary statistical data to assist in the new more rigorous appraisal/assessment process, OCUA requested that COU, through OCGS, provide data on five macro-indicators for each doctoral programme in the Province, in the years, 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77, viz.:

1. The number of full time and part time faculty;
2. The number of full time and part time students;
3. The number of students holding competitively awarded scholarships;
4. The dollar value of peer-adjudicated research grants awarded to faculty by national granting agencies; and
5. The number of degrees awarded.

At the same time OCUA proposed the addition of three more stringent criteria for funding new graduate programmes. Not only should the programmes be required to meet the new more rigorous appraisal standards, they should also be unique in the Province and fill a plainly apparent manpower need both in Ontario and in Canada as a whole.

The universities and COU were basically supportive of the thrust to place more emphasis on quality, and of the proposal to introduce quinquennial planning. They were much less enthusiastic about the introduction of doctoral macro-indicators, being concerned that the data supplied in response to the request of OCUA would be misinterpreted or over-emphasized or both, out of proportion to its accuracy or relevance. Despite their reservations, however, the universities undertook to compile and submit macro-indicator data in the summer of 1977.

To effect the desired modifications in the planning/appraisal process in order to emphasize a rigorous academic quality appraisal for each programme in a discipline as the first step in the planning process, OCGS/COU undertook an extensive modification of the by-laws and procedures of both the Appraisals Committee and the Advisory Committee on Academic Planning (ACAP). In addition to modifying the procedures for standard appraisals, special procedures were introduced for planning appraisals which would constitute an early phase in the planning process. Consultants for the planning appraisals would be asked to rate each programme on a five-point scale: international distinction; national distinction; good quality; minor improvements needed; major improvements needed. These quality judgments would then form the basis for the recommendations by ACAP concerning the overall arrangement of the programmes in that discipline in the Province. By agreement, the new procedures were implemented for a two year trial period beginning 1977-78.

After receiving comments from the universities and from COU in the Spring 1977 round of hearings and its own further reflections, in February 1978 OCUA issued another memorandum on graduate planning and funding. The quinquennial approach to graduate planning beginning in 1979-80 was reaffirmed as was the dominant theme for the first quinquennium: consolidation. The specific objectives for the quinquennium were refined, though, in order to enable them to be more readily assimilated into the internal planning and decision-making processes of the individual universities, and to assist in strengthening the programme and discipline review processes of the collectivity. The earlier four objectives now became six:

1. The recognition and protection of outstanding doctoral programmes;
2. The support of good quality graduate programmes;
3. The elimination of graduate programmes of unsatisfactory quality;
4. The prevention of further duplication;
5. The recognition of high quality programmes for which there is recognized need; and
6. The maintenance of a satisfactory amount of scholarship and research activity in the system.

This restatement of objectives differed from the earlier one primarily in that it made explicit a concern over the maintenance of sufficient scholarship and research activity in the Ontario universities. The clear recognition of this issue must be judged as highly significant when viewed against the prospect of an extended period of declining enrolments and straightened resources.

In addition, OCUA proposed four criteria for the funding of new graduate programmes introduced during the first quinquennium: evidence of need both in Ontario and in Canada as provided by ACAP and endorsed by COU; certification by ACAP through COU that no similar programme in the field(s) proposed is available in Ontario (with an exception in the case of master's programmes where there is strong evidence of regional importance and student demand); certification by ACAP through COU that the programme has passed a rigorous appraisal and was not found to require any improvements; and certification from the institution offering the programme that admissions had already commenced. At the same time OCUA noted that the ability of a programme to meet these four criteria would not necessarily guarantee a positive recommendation of funding, since in a given year adequate funding for all new programmes might not be available.

The response of COU and the universities to these criteria was mixed. There was ready acceptance of the first three, but the universities protested that the fourth criterion, which required the university to begin admitting students to the programme prior to a request for funding, was unduly burdensome. By the time the request for funding was received by OCUA a long period of preparation would have ensued during which the institution would be required to make a heavy commitment of its own resources without receiving any new support. Taken together with OCUA's statement that successfully meeting all four criteria would not guarantee a favourable recommendation on funding by OCUA, this was seen as a very large disincentive to the development of new graduate programmes even where they may be needed. Moreover, the final statement of OCUA suggested that there might be further 'hidden' criteria. Despite these arguments, however, the Minister accepted the criteria and they are to be in effect for the first quinquennium.

At the same time as it spelled out these new more stringent funding criteria for graduate programmes in Ontario, OCUA explicitly rejected greater centralization in graduate planning either by OCUA or the Ministry:

> Council's conclusions were that the value of institutional autonomy in Ontario outweighs the benefits, if any, that might be ascribed to a strengthening of central planning through structural change. The major role in graduate planning in Ontario must remain grounded in the universities, individually and collectively.[1]

For its part OCUA would continue to enunciate general quinquennial objectives, monitor the extent to which it judged these were being achieved, and recommend on the levels and mechanisms for funding appropriate to the achievement of these objectives. For assistance in fulfilling its functions, OCUA requested annual reports from COU on developments in the graduate sector.

On funding, OCUA recommended a return to a formula, with grants for master's and diploma programmes under a system essentially the same as for undergraduate programmes. For doctoral programmes OCUA recommended a ⅔ discount instead of a ½ discount for enrolment changes. In presenting these recommendations OCUA acknowledged that it had not yet determined which year or years to use in calculating the base, and invited the universities and COU to submit their views.

COU agreed with the OCUA's set of objectives for the graduate funding mechanism but proposed several modifications to OCUA's recommendations. COU accepted the proposal to adopt the current undergraduate formula for master's and graduate diploma programmes, and recommended that the three year base period be established as 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78, with a 50% discount for enrolment change. For doctoral programmes COU accepted the ⅔ discount factor but recommended a base period of five years in order to add a further element of stability in funding the longer duration doctoral programmes in a period of declining enrolment.

At the same time, because it was concerned for the need to maintain a dynamic graduate enterprise in this period of consolidation, COU requested that attention be given to developing some incentives to encourage individual institutions to reorganize their own graduate planning. As this is written the universities are awaiting the decisions of the government on which programmes will be funded during the first quinquennium. The advice of OCUA has been submitted to the Minister; the response has not yet been made public.

As mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, no COU activity has occupied so much attention or employed so many resources as the planning of graduate studies. And no area of activity has drawn more criticism. The direct costs of the appraisals/assessment exercises since the beginning now exceed more than $1.5 million and the total indirect costs to the individual universities run much higher. Critics have frequently questioned whether the effort has been worth the cost, but while the effort has been considerable and the results apparently meagre in some respects, there continues to be substantial support within the

[1]Ontario Council on University Affairs. ***Fourth Annual Report,*** 1977-78 (Toronto: Queen's Printer, 1978)

Ontario university community for this unique approach to graduate planning. Despite the burdensome bureaucracy and the problems created by the variable quality of consultants' reports, the process has helped to improve the academic quality of graduate programming in the Province and has assisted institutions to recognize more clearly their joint responsibility to plan cooperatively in this im portant area of academic activity. As we enter the first quinquennium, the need for careful planning is greater than ever and the voluntary approach will be more severely tested. The ability of the universities and of COU to meet these tests will likely determine the future of voluntary cooperation.

Chapter 3

University Cooperative Activities

The material in this chapter, dealing with cooperative activities among the Ontario universities sponsored by COU, was originally prepared for a paper presented to the Ontario Council on University Affairs in the spring of 1978, in response to a request from that body to present views on possible savings to the Ontario university system to be effected by merging certain services. Since current activities result from past initiatives and to some extent govern future prospects, this account also has a large historical component.

It should be noted first that some of the most significant examples of effective interuniversity cooperation are local or regional in scope and do not involve the entire system. For the most part these are not included here. It should also be noted that effective interuniversity cooperation does not necessarily involve direct financial savings. To the extent that cooperation produces efficiencies of operation, there are savings. However, as should be expected, often these savings are then used to improve levels and quality of service, not to reduce budget allocations. This chapter will give a number of examples of that effect. The general conclusion drawn is that the Ontario university system is stronger as a result of cooperative activities because the quality of the services offered is better.

Four specific areas are included in this account of COU-sponsored cooperative activities: application services, computing services, instructional development, and library services. The large and significant areas of cooperative activity undertaken on behalf of the Ontario universities by COU affiliates, COU committees and the COU Research Division are not included here. Taken together they constitute a further set of cooperative services organized and managed by COU on behalf of the system.

Coordination of Applications for Admission

Essentially a service activity on behalf of the applicants and the institutions, the central application system for admission to Ontario universities is one of the most visible successes in cooperation. Originating in the mid-sixties with the development of an informal decentralized system of agreed-upon dates, forms and procedures for admissions, the present system was formally established in 1971 with the institution of the Ontario Universities' Application Centre in Guelph, administered by a Board of Management named by COU.

The most convincing evidence of the Centre's value has been the steady increase in its range of activities. Initially the Centre handled only applications for

admission to first year of Ontario university undergraduate programmes. Now the operations cover preliminary year and Grade XII entry programmes, first year diploma programmes, and upper year undergraduate transfers. A service for admission to Ontario medical schools was introduced in 1974, and a service for admission to faculties of education will shortly be processing applications for entry in September 1979. The addition of a law applications services has been under discussion now for some time but opinion about it within the law faculties remains divided. Consideration could be given to adding other professional programmes with upper year entry, and graduate programmes. Initial development costs for the various programmes have been covered by grants from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, while the regular on-going expenses are covered by user fees.

The Application Centre, now in a stage of maturity, has become a recognized part of both the university and the secondary school systems of the Province. Under the cooperative procedures, confusion and duplication of effort resulting from multiple applications are substantially reduced, while at the same time it is possible to collect valuable statistics for use by institutional admissions and planning officers, COU, OCUA and MCU. Individual students retain the freedom to state their preferences for programme and institution; the individual universities continue to evaluate the qualifications of the applicants and to determine admission on the basis of their own institutional criteria.

The Application Centre provides an excellent example of the value of centralized services for a common and well understood objective. While introduction of these central services has not reduced institutional involvement with admissions activities, the system has benefited because application services have been greatly improved both for the individual applicants and for the participating institutions.

Computer Coordination

At present there is no significant COU sponsored involvement in the coordination of university computer services. But as an area which in the past has consumed considerable COU resources, even though results have been mixed, it deserves to be included in this account of COU efforts to promote interuniversity cooperation.

Over the years, the Council of Ontario Universities has been involved in several efforts to improve the quality and efficiency of computer services in Ontario universities. For a period of years it supported an Office of Computer Coordination and a Board for Computer Coordination. In 1972, detailed plans were developed for the establishment of a provincial university computer communications network (METANET), to be managed by a central body having the authority to plan and coordinate the future development of computing services in Ontario universities. After review, these proposals were overwhelmingly rejected by the universities. Given this response COU, while reaffirming its commitment to the value of coordination, scaled down its efforts to coordinate computer ser-

vices and restructured the Board for Computer Coordination. However, unable to develop a meaningful programme of activities, the Board recommended in April 1977 that it be dissolved. This recommendation was accepted and the responsibilities of the Board were assumed by the Executive Committee of COU.

Since 1967, a good deal of time and money have been spent by COU in promoting cooperation among the universities in the use of computers, thus illustrating the seriousness with which Council undertook the task of developing cooperation. When the decisions were made to reject plans for the establishment of a provincial computer network and to discontinue the Board, it seemed that these expenditures had been largely a waste. In retrospect, more recent developments in computer technology, which permit greater use of smaller local units and reduce the need for large central facilities, show the wisdom of the decision not to proceed with the network. Moreover, there has been some effective computer coordination at the local and regional level. A joint York-Ryerson computer centre has been established. Trent, the only Ontario university without its own computer facilities, has an effective working arrangement with the University of Toronto and Carleton University for servicing its computing needs. There is a regional computer planning committee involving Brock, Guelph, McMaster, Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier which sponsors a limited amount of computer sharing amongst its members. There are also various computer-based library projects, described below.

The successes and the failures of efforts to develop cooperation amongst universities in the area of computer coordination provide solid evidence that easy assumptions about large-scale savings to be achieved from cooperative ventures, especially ones depending on a large centralized operation, must be carefully examined in each case prior to making major investments.

Teaching and Learning: The Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development

The current Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development had its beginnings in 1970 when a study of educational technology was undertaken, jointly sponsored by the Committee of Presidents (predecessor to COU) and the Committee on University Affairs (predecessor to OCUA), to explore the relevance to the Ontario university system of a range of alternate approaches to educational technology. While the report[1] took as its starting point the application of television and other forms of technology, it placed great emphasis on the need for systematic development and evaluation of the instructional process. Among the recommendations was one that the universities of Ontario establish a 'centre for instructional development' to assist the faculties of Ontario universities in improving the effectiveness of instruction. This proposal was first endorsed in

[1] ***Television and Technology in University Teaching*** (Toronto: Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, 1970.)

principle but then revised to be a 'programme for instructional development' rather than a centre.

Approved by COU in December 1972, the Program was intended to assist faculties of Ontario universities in improving the effectiveness of instructional processes by systematic development of objectives, content, methods and evaluation for each course offered, and in developing appropriate economies in the application of instructional resources. A central group, supported by a small staff, would receive and evaluate proposals made by faculty to fund individual professional or course development, and provide modest consulting services. The Program was seen as experimental. The Joint Committee was maintained to oversee development, and a full time director was appointed in the summer of 1973, the first applications for grants were processed that fall. The work was begun in an atmosphere of mixed interest, skepticism and opposition. In choosing its initial strategy, the Committee decided to allocate its funds to individuals mainly in order to provide them with released time, and to encourage institutions to provide matching grants.

After its initial experience, in the spring of 1974 the Committee outlined its objectives and general approach, the criteria which would be considered in evaluating proposals, and the conditions of awards. In October of that same year, a procedure for evaluating the Program to date was agreed upon by the Committee. The evaluation was carried out by a three member team and its report was received a year later.[2] The main conclusion was that, while the Program had been useful in assisting with the professional development of individual faculty members and in introducing many innovations in teaching methods, a change in strategy was called for in order to promote greater institutional commitment to instructional development.

In responding to the report in the spring of 1976, COU constituted a new Committee on Teaching and Learning, with faculty, students, and lay membership. In line with the conclusions of the evaluators, this Committee revised the strategy for awarding of grants. The time had come for a policy which would encourage the universities to expend some of their own resources on instructional development so that teaching innovations and other short term results of the instructional development efforts of individuals might enjoy more long lasting effects. Under the new policy individual grants were discontinued and institutions were invited to apply for block grants. Primary criteria for assessment of applications were to include the degree of university commitment to instructional development, and an annual statement of instructional development goals, activities, and programme evaluation information. This institutional grant policy has been successful in encouraging universities to provide some internal support for instructional development; at present all but one Ontario university have some central 'focus' for their programmes in instructional development and pro-

---

[2] ***Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of the Ontario Universities Programme for Instructional Development*** (Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities, 1975)

vide some resources to support the programmes.

From the beginning, the Program for Instructional Development has been entirely funded by grants from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. In 1973-74, the level was $250,000. This rose to $500,000 in 1976-77 and 1977-78. The Ministry has accepted an OCUA recommendation that funding be phased out over the next two years (albeit with a one year delay in implementation), and the grant for 1978-79 is $350,000. The recommendation of OCUA to discontinue direct funding for instructional development is based on the philosophy that such earmarked funding should be 'seed money,' intended to encourage innovation, with the institutions making a commitment to continue the programmes so initiated. In the light of the plan to phase out direct funding for OUPID, the staff and the Committee are currently evaluating the Program and its prospects for the future.

While institutional commitment undoubtedly lies at the core of improving the teaching/learning process, it is important to recognize that some aspects of this process can be stimulated by interinstitutional cooperation, and that there are cases in which combining efforts can produce economies. A central coordinating body can effectively facilitate the exchange of information, reducing duplication of resources and effort. For example, a central office preparing bibliographies on the evaluation of instruction and arranging the sharing of resource persons can avoid wasteful efforts in these areas on each campus. (OUPID currently acts as a clearing-house for consultants and frequently puts those on one campus with problems in touch with those on another who are able to assist in resolving them.)

Through its continued support of OUPID and by the guidance it provides through its Committee on Teaching and Learning, COU has played and continues to play a key role in developing interinstitutional cooperation in this important area. The location of the OUPID offices within the COU secretariat since July 1977 has strengthened the relationship and improved the potential for further cooperative efforts.

University Library Cooperation

Since librarians have long recognized that no single library can be self-sufficient, the concept of cooperation on both the local and system levels is not a new one to Ontario university libraries. Indeed, they have been in the vanguard of cooperative activities. Today Ontario university libraries participate in a wide variety of cooperative ventures ranging from those at the local level through the provincial, interprovincial and national levels, and even on the international level in the case of interlibrary loans which know few, if any, barriers around the globe. Further, this cooperation is not restricted to university libraries but includes the entire library community: public, government, and other libraries as well as academic ones. Coordination among Ontario university libraries is organized through the Ontario Universities' Library Cooperative System (OULCS), established by COU in 1973 with three basic objectives: the provision

of superior information services to users; the rationalization of collection development; and the greater sharing of resources. The development of union files of machine readable records of the holdings of the participating libraries plays an essential role in the achievement of these goals.

Since its establishment, OULCS has initiated or further developed a number of projects which can be catagorized under three main headings: union catalogue projects; resource sharing projects; and collection development and rationalization projects. Participation in all of them is voluntary: the members jointly own and operate them in accordance with commonly accepted standards coordinated through the Office of Library Coordination (OLC) under the general management of the Board for Library Coordination.

Union Catalogue Projects

UNICAT/TELECAT (Union Catalogue/Télécatalogage)

The UNICAT/TELECAT project is a computer-based cataloguing support system providing participants with immediate access via 'on-line' computer terminals to bibliographic information contained in a central computer. It enables users to eliminate duplication of effort in cataloguing and in the production of catalogue cards or microfilm/microfiche, spine and book pocket labels, circulation cards and bibliographies. In support of longer term objectives for library rationalization, the system is building a union catalogue of holdings (to date, mainly monographs) which will assist cooperative collection development and facilitate interlibrary lending. Begun in 1973, and partially supported through its initial development by funds from the Ministry of Colleges and Universities[1], UNICAT/TELECAT is now entirely supported by the participating institutions. Present membership includes seven Ontario university libraries (Brock, Lakehead, Laurentian, McMaster, Ottawa, Toronto and York), six Quebec university libraries, two Ontario public libraries, and four government libraries (one federal and three in Quebec).

Initially concentrating on monographic records, the system now has a capacity of including serials and instructional media holdings. The union file now carries approximately 700,000 records, and by means of file-sharing agreements negotiated with various non-member libraries, participants currently have access to almost 2,000,000 records. Through the joint efforts of the members and the University of Toronto Library Automation Systems (UTLAS), the supplier of the computing facilities, a number of further developments intended to increase the usefulness of the system are under study.

Two types of benefits can be obtained by participating in a computer-based cataloguing support system of this kind: one comes through sharing; the other through automation *per se*. This cooperative project has provided many institu-

[1]The initial development is described fully in the publication ***UNICAT/TELECAT: A Report of the Cooperative Use of a Computer-based Cataloguing Support System*** (Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities, 1975)

tions with the facility to automate their cataloguing systems more fully while at the same time realizing economies through a sharing of effort.

It should be noted, however, that the economies of employing UNICAT/TELECAT to support cataloguing functions vary considerably among the members. Two principal factors account for this: the efficiency of the local system which has been replaced, and the efficiency of the user in reorganizing internal functions to exploit the potential of the computer system, a factor which changes over time as the user gains experience with the computer. Internal studies undertaken in some libraries show that the most efficient users of UNICAT/TELECAT have achieved significant cost reductions in processing acquisitions.

MEDICAT (Medical Catalogue)

This is a new project, developed at the initiative of a private foundation, the Hannah Institute/Associated Medical Services, with the goal of creating a complete union file of bibliographic records for medical and related subject areas, in order to improve medical information services. The plan calls for the inclusion of the holdings of the five Ontario medical schools, the academies of medicine in Toronto and Hamilton, the Addiction Research Foundation, and the Ontario Ministries of Health and Labour. It has been initiated as a pilot project involving the medical library at McMaster.

CODOC (Cooperative Government Documents Project)

CODOC is an automated listing system designed to provide ready and economical access to library holdings of government publications. Developed initially in 1967 by the University of Guelph, it became a formal cooperative project with the establishment of OULCS in 1973. Present membership includes twelve Ontario university libraries, two Quebec academic libraries, and one federal government library.

Twice a year each CODOC library local file is submitted to a central processing site for merging into a union master file. This union master file is then used to produce on microfiche a union shelf list accompanied by a title, corporate author and series index. Cumulative supplements are issued monthly on microfiche. The union file currently contains some 400,000 records. In addition to assisting with interlibrary lending, the CODOC project facilitates sharing of cataloguing resources and some collection specialization.

Some revenue is derived by leasing copies of the system to non-project members. To date the system has been leased to a number of agencies, including several universities outside Ontario, one of which is in the United States, government and municipal libraries, and the Canada Institute for Scientific and Technical Information (CISTI).

CUSS (Cooperative Union Serials System)

The CUSS project is an inexpensive means of providing both members and

non-members with a union list of serials titles and holdings. Ten Ontario universities and two Ontario public libraries are members. They merge their individual serials lists annually, matching citation by title, into a union list of serial titles, locations, and holdings on microfiche. Created without a group standard, this union list is produced simply by reaching agreement on the data elements common to each of the lists which must be included to produce the union list. The most recent edition of the CUSS list (the fifth) contained nearly 100,000 records.

At present the CUSS union list is used extensively to locate items for interlibrary loan and for collection building and rationalization purposes. It is anticipated that, as financial pressures on acquisitions budgets increase, the CUSS union list will be used much more heavily for collection decisions.

MAPS Project (Union List of Maps)

The MAPS project is at an early stage of development. Its first product in 1976 was a book form union list of atlases, containing some 300,000 entries. Interlibrary loans and an exchange of duplicates have also been initiated. Fourteen of the Ontario universities participate, along with l'Université Laval.

Resource Sharing Projects

Three related OULCS projects may be classified under the heading of 'resource sharing projects,' each of them facilitating cooperative use.

Interlibrary Lending and Borrowing

Interlibrary lending has long played an important role in library cooperation. All Ontario universities participate, and the activity involves exchange with all types of libraries both within and outside the Province. During 1976-77, Ontario universities loaned about 72,000 items (volumes, photocopies, microforms) and borrowed about 50,000. The difference represents net lending to libraries outside the Ontario university system. Lest this be misinterpreted as signifying the self-sufficiency of Ontario university libraries, it should be noted that some 28,000 items were borrowed by Ontario university libraries from outside the system.

Interuniversity borrowing is the counterpart project to interuniversity lending, and by it faculty, students and staff are able to borrow directly from institutions. To facilitate this a common user's card has been developed and an agreement on sanctions negotiated. All Ontario universities plus Ryerson participate and there is a reciprocal agreement covering Quebec university libraries.

A common misconception, shared apparently by many library users and some university administrators, is that borrowing from another library involves an almost cost-free use of the resources of others. The estimated average cost to the lender of filling an interlibrary loan is substantial, about $8.00, and the labour costs to the borrower likely equal this amount. On the basis of this estimate, then, a book borrowed twice will generate hidden costs to the borrower ap-

proaching the cost of purchasing and cataloguing a copy. However, when the borrowed item is a photocopy of an article from a seldom-used journal, the economics of borrowing are more compelling, since these costs are much less than those of purchasing a subscription. Such observations are made in order to place the value of interlibrary lending and borrowing in a proper perspective. For little-used library materials and for materials that are not available for purchase, this sharing of resources provides a valuable local service and is a concrete expression of interdependence. But it is not cheap.

Interuniversity Transit System

The Interuniversity Transit System is an ancillary service providing substantial economies as well as rapid reliable service and security for interlibrary lending. Begun in 1967 and operated by York University on behalf of COU, the service involves a fleet of vans providing daily service to all Ontario universities except Lakehead and Laurentian. Governmental libraries in Ottawa are also served and there is a link with a similar service offered in Quebec. Since 1972, the service has carried mail as well as books. In 1976-77, the net cost of operating the system (after making a deduction for postal savings) was $44,000. For this amount, the system carried about 60,000 items on interlibrary loan. The alternative cost of shipping these by post is estimated at $165,000.

Collection Development and Rationalization

Cooperative collection development has long been a concern among university libraries. For it is readily agreed that no institution can ever hope to be self-sufficient and that good use of scarce resources involves cooperation in the planning of collections in order to avoid unnecessary duplication.

In 1971, a system for major purchases was developed by the Ontario Council of University Libraries; it is administered by the Office of Library Coordination. It provides for the exchange of information about proposed major purchases and undertakes to avoid unnecessary duplication as well as to ensure that at least one copy of major items will exist in an academic library in Ontario. On a local and less formal basis, libraries located near one another consult regularly over the purchase of costly serial backruns and retrospective monograph collections. Where libraries are located sufficiently near to make practical use of one another's collections, rationalization of serials holdings is being undertaken. Guelph, Waterloo and Wilfrid Laurier, for example, have a priority system under which regional and provincial holdings are reviewed before serials purchases are initiated.

In 1973, a Collections Development Committee was established by the Board for Library Coordination. In its first year of operation the Committee developed a collection policy format of particular relevance to the ACAP assessments. Then the Committee was largely dormant until the spring of 1977 when it was reorganized by the Board and given two specific tasks: to analyze the titles in the UNICAT/TELECAT Union File, and to investigate the possibility

of developing a plan for the coordination of a programme of serial subscription cancellations. COU provided a special budget allocation to support the computer analysis. When this is completed an assessment of the potential for collection rationalization should be possible.

Perhaps the most difficult task is the development of a meaningful collection policy for the system that would provide better rationalization. Until now one of the major stumbling blocks has been the lack of adequate information about existing collections. The development of union data bases (CODOC, CUSS, UNICAT/TELECAT, MEDICAT and MAPS) will be of assistance here. Still, the task remains difficult and subject to factors not within the effective control of librarians.

Sometimes it is suggested that major financial savings could be achieved through collection rationalization and the excising of duplication. However, there are certain basic standards for academic library collections and these cannot be disregarded without striking at the roots of the entire academic process. Duplication among the campuses of many standard works is necessary, since the library is an integral part of the academic programming of the university and responds to the specific demands made upon it by the academic community it exists to serve. Even in these days of financial stringency new courses and programmes are developed. Moreover, knowledge continues to grow and thereby creates demands for additional expenditures to keep collections up to date.

While it is recognized that individual libraries can never be self-sufficient and there must be dependence on the resources of others, recourse to collection specialization has had limited success. The experience of other jurisdictions has been mixed. Recently the Ontario Council of University Libraries has agreed to investigate the feasibility of establishing a system of subject specialization by member libraries using as a basis existing collection strengths. However, the librarians by themselves are not in a position to agree on any pattern of subject specialization. Such decisions can only be made after there have been prior decisions on academic programming both within and among the institutions. There has been effective rationalization of holdings on some campuses through the consolidation of branch libraries, and we may expect to see more of this. For the evidence is clear that decentralization of library functions within a single institution, however desirable this might be in terms of the quality of service provided by close proximity to special collections, is very costly and increasingly a prohibitively expensive luxury.

The Benefits of Library Cooperation

When examining library cooperation it is important to bear in mind that there are real limits to the direct financial savings to be achieved. Cooperative ventures usually provide improved service and assist in holding costs down, although in some instances the short run costs may increase. Good cooperative programmes will produce savings, over the long run, both to the system and to the participating members.

It should also be stressed that cooperative ventures do not always provide equal benefits to all individual members. The location of an institution, the nature of its academic programmes, the extent to which it has a sophisticated library system of its own: all of these factors influence the benefits of belonging to a cooperative venture. Even when savings can be achieved internally, these must be balanced against the costs of participating in the system. Interlibrary lending and borrowing are examples of this, as mentioned above. The costs of travel, telephone, documentation, and staff resources, including the central administrative superstructure required for participation in the more complex projects, are genuine considerations; taken together they are the reasons why some member universities do not choose to participate in some of the OULCS joint projects. It has been argued, not without some foundation, that the existing cooperative projects could be improved by requiring institutional participation, by insisting that those institutions not now involved be required to join. Any such suggestion should be rejected, not only because it is inherently unattractive, but more importantly because our experience shows that effective cooperation can only be achieved through voluntary participation. All OULCS projects, for example, are 'owned' and managed by the participant groups; their success rests on the fact that management decisions are made by the group and enjoy their support. Certainly there is room for further cooperative activity among Ontario universities, particularly at the regional level. However, if it is to be effective those who undertake it must first be persuaded of the need and then agreed on its value.

Chapter 4

An Uncertain Future

The preceding chapters of this *Review* have been largely retrospective and descriptive, providing a brief account of the major factors affecting Ontario's universities both individually and collectively over the past three years. The present chapter provides some reflections on the current state of the Ontario universities and their prospects for the future. The key-note of these reflections is uncertainty: uncertainty over finances, over enrolment, over staffing, over the structure of the system, but above all uncertainty over the role and place of universities in society.

The Financial Future

As indicated in Chapter 1, the universities are facing a very difficult financial future as a result of the current government fiscal restraint programme. The continuation of hard times was signalled by OCUA in the fall of 1977 when it advised the universities of the likelihood that all publicly supported programmes in the Province faced at least three years of financing below the levels to have come to expect, and asked the institutions to inform OCUA of the plans they had for coping with 'the new reality.' This communication also requested the universities to indicate what savings might be effected through merging administrative support services, academic programmes and even institutions. After some initial shock, the request stimulated the universities to review the possibilities for further cooperation, and the results of these exercises were presented to OCUA in the spring of 1978. The general conclusion was that some further coordination and cooperation is possible, but it will not likely generate any large scale financial savings.

In its 1978 brief to OCUA, significantly entitled *The Price of Restraint*, COU outlined the cumulative effect on the Ontario university system of the proposed government fiscal constraints. Taking as its starting point the financial guidelines previously accepted by both OCUA and the government (that global funding for the system should be sufficient to enable the universities to meet inflation, maintain current levels of quality and service, and accommodate enrolment changes), COU calculated the minimum revenue requirements of the universities at an annual increase of 6.9% over the next three years. The budget projections issued by the Provincial Treasurer indicate grant increases within a range of 4.5% to 5.8% per annum over the same period. If tuition revenue were to remain frozen, the minimum revenue requirements as calculated by COU would necessitate an increase in grant revenue of 9.1% per annum. On this basis,

using the lower projected figure for increases in grant revenue, the universities would receive an increase 50% less than that regarded as a basic minimum. Whatever the precise method of calculating the projected increase, all signs indicated a substantial reduction in revenues. For the system this would mean a decline in the range and quality of available academic services; for some universities it could be a matter of survival.

To illustrate the seriousness of the situation, the COU brief presented the results of a modelling exercise on alternative ways of closing the expenditure/revenue gap, one by increasing revenue from tuition fees, the other by reducing expenditures on staff. In the extreme case projected, if the universities were to obtain all of the needed additional revenue from higher tuition fees, an increase in fees amounting to 20% per annum would be required, resulting in a doubling of tuition fees by 1981. If, on the other hand, tuition fees were to remain frozen, the universities would have to reduce their staffs by more than 15% by 1981 in order to balance their budgets. This would mean some 2,000 fewer faculty and an accompanying decrease in the number of support staff. Neither scenario is seen by COU as acceptable. Such sobering exercises, together with the growing awareness of the government's plans, have provoked another look at tuition fees, student aid and the entire question of accessibility to university education in Ontario, as well as further review of the increasingly pressing problems affecting staff.

Tuition Fees and Student Aid

Although they currently account for less than one-fifth of the universities' operating revenues, tuition fees are the largest source of non-governmental revenue and remain a vital part of institutional income. As the real level of grants declines and budget pressures increase, the significance of this revenue source increases. In law, the responsibility for setting tuition fees belongs to each university; in fact, these fees are controlled by the government. This is accomplished by establishing the value of the Basic Income Unit to include a standard formula fee which is deducted from the grant paid each university on behalf of its registered students.

In recent years tuition fees have twice been increased by unilateral government decision. In 1973-74 the standard undergraduate fee was increased by $100 per annum and the graduate fee from $588 to $877 for a two term year (thereby effectively doubling tuition fees for those graduate students enrolled for three terms in the year). The universities protested the decision, but to no avail. In the end they decided to increase undergraduate tuition fees by the announced amount, but because they considered the increase in graduate fees unreasonable and punitive, they decided not to pass on the third term fee and thus to absorb the loss in revenue. Tuition fees were increased in 1977-78, again by $100, but this time the protests, except from organized student groups, were muted. Government grants had fallen below the universities' estimates of need and the increased revenue from fees would offset this shortfall. Controversy

over tuition fees began to increase, however, stimulated by student groups which argued that changes in tuition fee levels and in student aid in the context of severe inflation and growing unemployment were having adverse effects on accessibility.

In late 1975, a Special Programme Review Committee established by the government issued a report which recommended a reduction in government expenditures, including a reduction in grants to colleges and universities. This Committee recommended that universities be allowed again to establish their own tuition fees, and that the proportion of university costs borne by the students should rise to about 24-28% (the level during the mid-sixties). The Committee also recommended changes in the student awards programme to decrease the maximum grant allowance and increase the maximum loan allowance.

COU addressed the matter of tuition fees in the spring of 1976 and approved a statement of principles governing the setting of such fees. While reaffirming the right of the universities to set tuition fees, Council stated that this right should be exercised reasonably and responsibly within clearly defined limits. Fees ought not to remain fixed during a period of increasing costs. At the same time, there should not be a rapid increase in the proportion of costs borne by the student (as proposed by the Special Programme Review Committee), and increases in tuition fees should be accompanied by adjustments in student aid in order to maintain accessibility. Moreover, fee differentials for different programmes should be related primarily to considerations of accessibility, not to programme costs or to future income prospects for the student.

In 1976, a committee established to review the Ontario Student Assistance Programme issued an interim report. It proposed major revisions in the student assistance programme designed to increase accessibility for students from low-income backgrounds while encouraging individual responsibility and fostering choice. The proposed new programme, to be called the Option Loan and Need-Tested Grant Programme (OLANG), would offer government guaranteed interest-bearing loans to any student, part time or full time, who applied for them and grants to students who met the qualifications by a means test. It was to replace the Canada Student Loan and Ontario Student Loan schemes as well as OSAP. Criticized by organized student groups because of the loan provisions and the means test for grants, criticized by others because of complexity, the recommendations were not accepted by the government, in part because of the practical difficulties in negotiating a satisfactory end of the Canada Student Loan scheme with the federal government. However, the Minister of Colleges and Universities promised a revised Ontario student assistance programme.

In the fall of 1977, after many months of preparation, the new programme was announced, to be implemented in 1978-79. The new Ontario Student Assistance Programme (OSAP) contains a number of improvements. Students who qualify on a means test are eligible for a grant before being required to take out a loan and the size of the grant eligibility of low income students is greater.

All students are eligible for a higher total combined grant and loan. The plan is open to both full time and part time students. The grants are now limited to four years, however, thus excluding graduate students and students in advanced years of professional programmes who would have qualified under the old scheme. Moreover, the new stricter means test involves applicants and parents agreeing to provide access to personal income tax records, and the application process is more complicated.

Student organizations responded immediately with a barrage of criticism, complaining that the new programme would effectively reduce accessibility to university education by erecting further barriers to students from low income backgrounds, in particular those seeking to pursue professional programmes such as dentistry, law and medicine, and graduate work. The response from the other segments of the university community was more cautious. The new programme provided some clear improvements over the preceding one. But the strict rules on grant eligibility, the administrative complexities, combined with the strong criticism and plain uncertainty about the plan's provisions appear to have combined to produce a significant decline in the number of applicants for assistance under the new programme. The programme is experiencing major administrative problems, with long delays in processing applications and widespread complaints both from students and awards officers. The longer term effects remain to be seen.

In the spring of 1978, the Minister undertook a study of tuition and incidental fees, employing consultants for this purpose. The announcement of this review has sparked rumours of an impending further increase in tuition fees. Student organizations have orchestrated a concerted opposition to any further increase in tuition fees, arguing that higher fees in 1977-78 were an important factor causing the unexpected decline in enrolment, and that the new student aid plan, high tuition fees and 'cutbacks' in university spending are now all contributing to a further reduction in accessibility to university. The main current of opinion, however, seems to be running in the opposite direction. The universities, strapped for funds, see some relief at the margin from an increase in tuition fees. They are unlikely though, to raise fees so high as to adversely affect enrolment, and would not wish the government to use a tuition fee increase as a reason for further reductions in the levels of grants. They would certainly want a corresponding increase in student aid to avoid further adverse effects on accessibility. Although extremely difficult to determine with any degree of accuracy, the effects of the increasing costs of university education on accessibility and the participation rate should be carefully monitored. Should tuition fee autonomy be reintroduced, the effect of this on competition among institutions will also require attention.

Staffing the Universities

Nowhere are the uncertainties facing Ontario universities more clear than in the area of staffing. Faculty are the heart of the university enterprise, and an ade-

quate complement of academic support staff is essential for maximum efficient use of faculty. During the expansion period the numbers of faculty and support staff grew rapidly; now that expansion has ended and revenue has failed to keep pace with inflation, the pressures on faculty and support staff complements are becoming severe. The general pressures produced by 'steady state' or declining enrolment and the failure of revenue to match inflation are compounded by a number of particular factors: continuing growth pressures in certain academic disciplines, such as commerce, where enrolment continues to climb; the badly skewed faculty age profile resulting from the recent rapid expansion; the system of academic tenure; the advent of unionization; the increased complexity of administration.

At the beginning of the period of rapid expansion, Ontario universities were unable to meet the growing need for qualified faculty from Canadian resources. To fill their requirements they placed high priority on expanding graduate studies and at the same time appointed substantial numbers of foreign-trained academics. About the time the newly expanded graduate schools began to produce doctorates in goodly numbers, the combination of the decline in the rate of enrolment increase and reduced levels of funding forced the universities to decrease sharply the rate of new faculty hiring. As a consequence, career opportunities for young scholars were seriously diminished and university faculty complements became more or less frozen with a badly skewed age profile. Now, with the system at best stable in size, there is very little flexibility in the faculty complements. The great majority of full time faculty are tenured or in the tenure stream. Given an average age between forty and forty-five, there is very little attrition by reason of retirement; given traditional practices on career salary progression, there is an ever-increasing pressure on operating budgets to meet the costs of salaries and staff benefits. At the present time nearly 50% of the operating costs of universities are for academic staff; total staff costs account for 80%. When such a large portion of university expenditures is allocated to staff, and gross revenues do not match inflation, the agonizing options of trading off salary increases for complement size move quickly to centre stage.

In the spring of 1976 a joint committee between COU and the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations issued a report, *The Ivory Tower and The Crystal Ball*, which analyzed in some detail the Ontario university faculty profile and outlined the kinds of action that should be taken if the universities are to have effective policies for academic career development. These affect appointments, promotions, tenure, retirement plans, pensions and other staff benefits, etc. While a number of individual institutions have begun to develop policies in these areas, to date there has been relatively little done on a system-wide basis. In the meantime, the anxiety level of both faculty and support staff has risen perceptibly, as illustrated by the continuing movement towards unionization and the increased incidence of strikes. Since planning staff development, along with academic programme planning, is at the heart of the academic planning exercise, there is increasing urgency to deal with these issues. The pre-

sent lack of career opportunities for young scholars, with its negative implications for the academic vitality of the universities, must be resolved before an entire generation of scholars is lost.

The growth of faculty collective bargaining, which now involves four universities in the Province, produces a further element of uncertainty. To date the effects on the collegial, participatory forms of institutional self-governance do not appear large, but the long term net effect will likely be a diminution of the role of the academic senate. Already the effects on the role of dean and departmental chairmen, as well as on the administrative style in the academy, are becoming obvious. The future of faculty unionism and of the university as it is presently organized will depend in large measure on the ability of the academic staff, administration and governing bodies together to evolve effective means of reconciling the defense of legitimate faculty economic and professional interests with the continuing pursuit of academic excellence in teaching and research.

Burgeoning Nationalism

A relatively new development, one affecting both academic staff and students, deserves mention here. The '70s have seen a substantial growth in feelings of Canadian nationalism. This has been expressed in various ways, including a quickening interest in all things Canadian and a growing criticism of those persons and institutions in the country judged insufficiently concerned with Canadianism. The universities, whose traditions of scholarship transcend national boundaries, have not been immune. They have been heavily criticized by editorial writers and politicians for their failure to give proper emphasis to matters Canadian in their academic programmes, a shortcoming frequently related to the high proportion of non-Canadians holding faculty appointments. In recent years the emergence into maturity of Canadian graduate schools has produced a growing cadre of young Canadian scholars and scientists seeking professional appointments, while the rate of increase in new faculty hirings has declined. In this climate the contributions of the many non-Canadians who immigrated to this country in the late '60s to assist in staffing the rapidly expanding universities, whose needs could not be met in sufficient number by Canadians, tended to be forgotten; pressures have developed to reserve Canadian universities for Canadians, both faculty and students.

In 1975, the report of a Select Committee on Economic and Cultural Nationalism of the Ontario Legislature expressed strong disapproval of the Ontario universities' failure to appoint more Canadians to faculty and recommended a quota on non-Canadian appointments. Later the same year the Minister of Colleges and Universities, under pressure from the opposition in the House, announced to COU that he was not satisfied with the continuing numbers of foreign faculty hirings, and enjoined executive heads to ensure that qualified Canadians were provided adequate opportunities for faculty appointments. In response, the executive heads agreed to assume direct responsibility for seeing

that all qualified Canadian applicants for faculty positions were carefully reviewed, and that recommendations for the appointment of a non-Canadian would be approved only if it had been demonstrated that no qualified Canadian was available. At the same time, the executive heads insisted that they would not distinguish between Canadians and landed immigrants. This procedure has been in effect now for three years and while it has not entirely silenced the criticism it has avoided the harsher alternatives of instituting quotas or of requiring ministerial approval of individual foreign faculty appointments. During the past three years the percentage of Canadian citizens on the faculty of Ontario universities has risen slowly, from 67.6% to 74.1%, and the number of new foreign faculty appointments has steadily declined both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of the new hirings. For 1977-78, data on new faculty appointments in Ontario universities (excluding visiting professors), show that 90% are Canadian or landed immigrant, and only 10% are foreign.

In 1976 foreign students felt the effect of this burgeoning nationalism. During the early '70s their number in Ontario universities steadily increased. In 1977-78, tuition fees for entering visa students were raised to $1,500 per annum, effectively doubling undergraduate tuition fees. This decision, made by the Minister without consultation with the universities, COU or OCUA, took the university community by surprise and raised a storm of protest. The universities were strongly tempted to defy the decision, but in the end only two declined to impose the higher fee in 1977-78. The majority, while continuing to protest the decision, decided that they could not forego the income and reluctantly imposed the higher fee. In effect now for one year, the higher fee has had some negative effect on visa student enrolment. Total undergraduate visa student enrolment has declined slightly and the mix of visa students has altered somewhat, with fewer students from the poor countries and with small personal resources. Undoubtedly, the establishment of the higher fees for visa students has made Ontario a less attractive place to these students. Subsequently, two other provinces, Alberta and Quebec, have instituted similar fee differentials for visa students, and the trend appears likely to spread. A fear that this may lead to the establishment of fee differentials for out-of-province students to date remains without foundation.

In early 1978, a third development adversely affecting foreign nationals in Ontario universities surfaced. Concern on the part of the federal Department of Employment and Immigration over the growing number of foreign nationals entering Canada as visa graduate students and receiving work permits to enable them to take up teaching and research assistantships, in combination with the growing unemployment rate among young people in the country, resulted in a review of the relevant immigration regulations. Active consideration was given to requiring the universities to advertise all part time teaching assistantships, and to meet the same requirements in offering them to visa students as for offering faculty appointments to off-shore foreign nationals. The universities protested these proposals and at the time of writing have been informed that the federal

government has no present plans to modify the existing regulations affecting work permits at least through 1979-80. Here the matter rests, but other recent changes in immigration regulations affecting foreign students will likely further reduce their numbers.

The Structure of the System

The future of OCUA and of COU, the two bodies that stand between the individual universities and the government, is as uncertain as the future of the institutions themselves. The fifteen provincially assisted universities in Ontario are autonomous institutions grouped into a collectivity by voluntary membership in the Council of Ontario Universities. Through COU they interact with one another, with OCUA and with the Ministry. As the universities' problems deepen, and we move further into a period of consolidation and retrenchment, the pressures for centralized planning grow at the same time as competition among them for increasingly scarce resources, for students, and for means of preserving their institutional autonomy, intensifies. Whether the existing structures of voluntary association through COU and advisory buffering through OCUA are adequate in these conditions is again a highly topical question.

The Ontario Council on University Affairs has existed in its present form for four years, during which it has developed a satisfactory regular pattern of consultation with the universities and with COU. The advice of OCUA on a wide range of university affairs has been forwarded regularly to the government and subsequently made public. The track record on acceptance by the government of this advice has been very good, with one ominous and conspicuous exception, the recommendation on the general level of funding for 1978-79, an exception that is almost certain to be repeated again this year for the academic year, 1979-80. However, as a buffer body, OCUA is frequently criticized by the universities for failing to carry their case effectively to government, being more concerned with anticipating the government's position. At the same time, OCUA is seen by government as being too much an uncritical advocate on behalf of the universities. This is both normal and understandable.

Recently there has been growing criticism within the university community of OCUA's failure to deal effectively with some of the hard issues now facing the Ontario university system, for example, tuition fees. OCUA remains a champion of institutional autonomy, which it continuously interprets as requiring the universities themselves, individually and through COU, to accept responsibility for planning the system and for managing it responsibly within the resources that are made available. This position, while accepted in principle by the great majority of members of the Ontario university community, is coming under more serious questioning, both in terms of what responsible administration implies when resources are seriously inadequate and what planning means when the good of individual institutions may differ from the good of the system.

During the past year, OCUA has acted to stimulate the Ontario universities

to devote more attention to planning both for themselves as institutions and on behalf of the system. In September 1978, it issued a white paper, *The Ontario System: A Statement of Issues*, which outlined some of the major problems and explored briefly the options. Part IV of that paper, entitled "Autonomy and Control: Structural Alternatives", summarized briefly the advantages and disadvantages of four alternatives, including both the strengthening of and the abolition of OCUA. The universities and COU have been invited to comment in the next round of OCUA hearings scheduled for the spring of 1979. This renewed interest in planning is evident also within COU, which has established a standing Committee on Long-Range Planning with broad terms of reference. The first task of this Committee will be to prepare a COU response to the OCUA white paper.

The structure of the system also intimately involves the role of COU. As a voluntary association of member institutions, COU can and does perform many useful activities on behalf of its members and the collectivity, but by its nature it must have overall consensus for major decisions. This means that when the legitimate interests of member institutions are in basic conflict with one another, it is really not possible for COU as presently constituted to develop a position on the issues in question. In important respects the present structure of the Ontario university system is predicated on twin assumptions: that the good of the system is constituted by the sum total of the good of its institutional member constituents; and that competition among the institutions on academic grounds within voluntarily accepted constraints serves the well-being of the system. As the universities of Ontario move further into the new reality of the late '70s and the '80s, these assumptions are being severely tested. Whether the existing structure, including OCUA and COU in their present form, will continue depends on how well these assumptions stand the test.

Planning the Future

A considerable amount of effort and a great deal of rhetoric has always been devoted to planning in the universities. Fashions in planning change with circumstance, though, and the kind of planning that is most needed today differs substantially from the requirements only a few years ago. For the past two decades the universities have been planning for growth. Now they are having to plan for no growth or for a decline in size. Only yesterday, the problem was planning for more; now it is planning for less. Such planning is extraordinarily difficult: first, because the universities have had no recent experience with planning of this sort; and second, because of the many uncertainties. In the face of such large uncertainty there is a temptation not to plan at all, since unanticipated new circumstances can vitiate the most carefully developed plans. This is to run the risk that planning will be imposed by others. Another temptation, one to which universities are especially prone, is to assume that the future will be very like the past, in particular the recent past, and to plan simply for more (or for

less) of the same. But the future may be very much different from the immediate past for the universities, since the expansion of the '60s and '70s was quite unlike anything ever experienced in the long history of universities. Whatever the details, an essential characteristic of sound planning for the immediate future must be flexibility, creating plans with an inherent capacity to respond to circumstances whose precise nature and force cannot be measured in advance with much accuracy. At the same time, however, sound planning must be based on a clear understanding and broad acceptance of basic objectives.

One of the valuable by-products deriving from the current beleagured state of the universities is the pressure on them to reexamine their basic goals, to restate these goals clearly and to rededicate themselves to their achievement. In this area lies a basic problem and a genuine danger. For there is some uncertainty even within the universities about what these basic aims are, and because of this no clear consensus on them is being conveyed to the wider public outside the universities. Thus the image of the universities in the eyes of this public is obscured at the very time that it is crucially important for the nature and importance of higher learning to be well understood.

The enormous expansion of universities that began in the '60s and continued until recently was part of a world-wide educational revolution in which formal education was seen to hold the key to economic, social and cultural development. Broader access to education, particularly university education, and greater investment in research, especially mission-oriented research, were everywhere advocated as a necessary and effective means of progress. University education was praised for its ability to expand opportunities for personal fulfillment and private gain, but even more for its ability to improve the economic and social well-being of peoples. Investment in higher education was regarded as primarily an investment in human capital, a notion that lay behind the widespread support for massive public expenditures on universities, and the acceptance by government of the principle of universal accessibility to higher education. At the same time this notion stimulated great expectations on the part of students, including expectations for high personal career earnings. (The more you learn, the more you'll earn.) As a consequence, the university came to be viewed as an agency primarily serving the nation, paid for increasingly by the taxpayer, and satisfying the needs of industry, business, and government for competent graduates. Subscribed to by most opinion leaders, including those in the universities, these notions lay behind the transformation of the universities from ivory towers to public utilities. The immediate, direct effects of these changes have now become clear; their long term implications for the universities have yet to be fully realized.

The very expansion produced large changes in labour market conditions for university graduates. When only a small percentage of young people attained a university degree, they constituted an elite whose prospects for professional careers and lucrative employment were very high. Once the size of this group increased significantly, the career prospects for this much larger number were

substantially altered. Moreover, other factors were at work to exacerbate the situation further. An abnormal age distribution created by the post-war baby boom enlarged the size of the cohort entering the labour force, and recessionary forces in the economy produced substantial unemployment. The result has been an apparent surplus of university graduates, with attendant criticism of the institutions for failing to equip their graduates for immediate success in the labour market, and intense pressures on them to provide more vocational and professional programmes.

The flight of university students from programmes in arts and science into professional programmes and the steady increase in community college enrolment are plain for all to see. These shifts in student preferences, reflecting their vocational interests, are now generating great pressures on the universities, external pressures to make them conform more closely to the ostensible requirements of manpower planning, and internal pressures to reallocate the fixed global resources on the basis of programme requirements developed to meet enrolment needs. Through all of this there is considerable danger that the traditional values of a liberal education in the arts and sciences will be submerged in the struggle to develop more professional and vocationally oriented forms of education.

At the same time, given the linkage of funding and enrolment forged by the operating grants formula, there are dangers to scholarship and research arising from the anticipated declines in enrolment. Already, significant elements of the graduate enterprise are at risk because of substantial declines in enrolment in the core disciplines. Now the decline in undergraduate enrolment in arts and science is increasing the risk. The role of the university in fostering research and scholarship has never been well understood in the wider community outside. Since university funding has been so closely associated in the mind of the public with enrolment, today when declines in enrolment seem imminent it has become very important to explain the need for a continuing strong commitment to the support of research and scholarship in the universities.

The Ontario universities face an uncertain future. How the individual institutions themselves and as a collectivity through COU respond to the current difficulties will determine to a large extent what this future will be. Most of the problems are seen primarily in terms of declining financial resources. But the future is likely to depend more upon the ability of the universities to defend their essential freedoms than upon funding. This ability in turn will depend upon a continuing clear and firm commitment by the universities to their basic academic objectives. For in the last analysis integrity is more important than resources. If our institutions of higher learning are to continue to serve society they must remain dedicated to the highest academic standards in both instruction and research, and they must be seen to be so dedicated. To divert the university from these essential tasks simply to maintain the enterprise at its present size or to be concerned merely with the management of decline is insufficient. Moreover, it is bound ultimately to fail. Members of the university community, in the institutions

themselves and in the agencies such as COU which act on their behalf, must make their decisions and direct their actions on this basis. Despite the many troubling uncertainties the future of our system is secure as long as those in whose care it rests remain firm in their commitment to the traditional ideals of the universities.

Appendix A

Members of the Council of Ontario Universities and Secretariat at December 1, 1978

	Members
Brock University	— A.J. Earp, President D.J. Goodspeed, Department of History
Carleton University	— M.K. Oliver, President P.M. Laughton, Department of Chemistry
University of Guelph	— D.F. Forster, President*, *Chairman* C.L. Gyles, Department of Veterinary Microbiology and Immunology
Lakehead University	— G.A. Harrower, President J.G. Rideout, Faculty of Arts
Laurentian University	— H.B.M. Best, President W. Cragg, Department of Philosophy
McMaster University	— A.N. Bourns, President* M. Levinson, Department of Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics
Université d'Ottawa	— R. Guindon, Recteur P. Morand, Faculty of Science and Engineering
Queen's University	— R.L. Watt, Principal*, *Vice-Chairman* A.J. Marshall, Department of Classics
University of Toronto	— J.M. Ham, President* W.B. Dunphy, St. Michael's College
Trent University	— T.E.W. Nind, President R.D. Chambers, Department of English Literature*
University of Waterloo	— B.C. Matthews, President M.P. Bryden, Department of Psychology
University of Western Ontario	— G.E. Connell, President D.E. Gerber, Department of Classical Studies
Wilfrid Laurier University	— N.H. Tayler, President G. Carroll, Department of Business
University of Windsor	— M. Franklin, President D. Briggs, Department of Political Science*
York University	— H.I. Macdonald, President* A. Murray, Faculty of Environmental Studies

Associate Members

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	— C.C. Pitt, Director J. Mallea, Assistant Director (Academic)
Royal Military College of Canada	— A.J.G.D. de Chastelain, Commandant J.R. Dacey, Principal
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute	— W.G. Pitman, President J.L. Packham, Vice-President (Academic)

Secretariat

E.J. Monahan, Executive Director*
G.G. Clarke, Secretary and Deputy to the Executive Director
M. de Pencier, Assistant Secretary

Research Division
- E.K. DesRosiers, Director of Research
- C.F.W. Isaacs, Research Associate
- J.T. O'Mahony, Research Associate
- L.C. Payton, Research Associate

Office of Library Coordination
- R.E. Stierwalt, Director
- A. Bailey, Technical Assistant, French Language
- L. Farmer, Coordinator of Operations and Standards
- S. Gann, Technical Assistant, English Language
- J. Leishman, Administrative Officer

Ontario Council on Graduate Studies
- H.H. Yates, Executive Vice-Chairman
- S.C. Girard, Research Officer

Ontario Universities' Application Centre
- H.W. Pettipiere, Director
- G.S. Arthurs, Assistant Director

*Member of the Executive Committee

Appendix B

Constitution

Council of Ontario Universities
Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario

(This body was formed on December 3, 1962, with the original name of the "Committee of Presidents of Provincially Assisted Universities and Colleges of Ontario." A formal constitution was first adopted on December 9, 1966, under the name "Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario/Comité des Présidents d'Université de l'Ontario." The constitution was amended on January 18, 1968; April 26, 1968; March 13, 1970; and April 16, 1971. On the latter date, the name of the body was changed to its present one, effective May 1, 1971.)

1. Name
   (1) The name of this body shall be: "Council of Ontario Universities/Conseil des Universités de l'Ontario."

2. Objects
   (1) The objects of the Council are to promote cooperation among the provincially assisted universities of Ontario, and between them and the Government of the Province, and, generally, to work for the improvement of higher education for the people of Ontario.

3. Membership
   (1) Those eligible for membership are (a) the executive heads of provincially assisted universities in Ontario which grant university degrees (a power conferred by a legislative or parliamentary act or charter in which such authority is specifically stated) but excluding institutions whose power to grant degrees is limited to a single professional field; and (b) one colleague, elected to membership by the senior academic body of each such institution.
   (2) Colleagues elected to membership by the senior academic body of those institutions defined in article 3, section (1), part (a), shall hold office for a term of one year, renewable.
   (3) At the time of the coming into force of this amendment on May 1, 1971, members shall be the executive heads and elected colleagues of the universities as defined in article 3, section (1), part (a).
   (4) Members from other institutions which become eligible to provide members may be admitted if recommended by the Executive Committee and approved by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting at a meeting of the Council.

4. Officers
   (1) The Council shall have a Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall serve without remuneration.
   (2) The Council shall have a Vice-Chairman, elected from and by its members for a term of two years. He shall act for the Chairman in the absence of the latter. He, too, shall serve without remuneration.
   (3) The Council shall have as its senior paid officer an Executive Director, appointed by the Executive Committee with the concurrence of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Council. Included in his functions shall be those of secretary and treasurer of the Council.
   (4) The Council may have other paid officers, and sub-staff, as deemed necessary by the Executive.

5. Committees
   (1) There shall be a committee called "the Executive" composed of eight members: the Chairman of the Council (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Director (who shall have no vote), the immediate past Chairman (ex officio), and four others. The membership of eight shall include at least one from the University of Toronto, one from among the emergent universities and four from the intermediate-sized universities. Its function is to guide the Council and, on occasion, to act for it between meetings of the Council.
   (2) There shall be a "Committee on Nominations," named by the Chairman with the approval of the Executive. It shall propose candidates for the elective offices and for membership of the Executive. It may also, from time to time, nominate members of other committees, and shall review committee membership and terms of reference as provided for by subsection (5) below.
   (3) There may be such other committees (standing and special) as are deemed necessary.
   (4) Members of standing committees shall serve for terms of not more than two years. They may be reappointed. Members of a special committee normally will serve for the duration of the committee.
   (5) At least once every two years, normally after the election of officers and the naming of a new Executive, the Committee on Nominations shall review the terms of reference and membership of committees of the Council and suggest to the Executive such changes as may seem desirable.

6. Affiliates
   (1) Other organizations or associations of personnel serving in the universities of Ontario may be affiliated to the Council.
   (2) Such bodies may be established by the Council or may come into being on the initiative of others.
   (3) Normally an affiliate would have some executive power delegated to it, explicitly or implicitly, by the Council.
   (4) Affiliates shall be responsible to the Council with respect to those of their interests and functions which fall within the scope of the activities of the Council.

7. Meetings
   (1) The Council shall meet at least twice a year.
   (2) Meetings of the Council and of the Executive may be called by the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Director, or any three other members of the Council.
   (3) A member who is the executive head of an institution and is unable to attend a meeting of the Council may be represented at the meeting by an alternate of his choosing. A member who is an elected colleague who is unable to attend a meeting of the Council may be represented by an alternate selected by the senior academic body of the institution he represents. Alternates shall have the power to vote at the meeting.
   (4) Committees will meet as required.
   (5) A majority of the members of the Council or of a committee shall constitute a quorum for a meeting of the Council or committee concerned.

8. Finance
   (1) The fiscal year of the Council shall end June 30.
   (2) The chief source of financial support of the Council shall be subscriptions paid by the universities whose executive heads are members of the Council.
   (3) The scale of membership subscriptions shall be set by action of the Council.
   (4) The Council may receive additional financial support from other sources.

(5) The accounts of the Council shall be audited by a firm of auditors appointed by authority of the Council for terms of one year, renewable.

9 Amendment

(1) This constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority of members of the Council present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the proposed amendment is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

10 Dissolution

(1) The Council may be dissolved by a two-thirds majority of members of the Council present and voting at a meeting in the notice of which the motion for dissolution is specified and at which at least two-thirds of the members are present.

(2) In the event of dissolution of the Council, all assets and property of the Council shall, after payment of its just debts and obligations, be distributed to one or more charitable organizations in Canada, as may be determined by the Council.

Appendix C

Committees, Boards and Affiliates of the Council of Ontario Universities at December 1, 1978

Committees

Standing Committees

1. *Executive Committee*
   Task:
   (a) To guide the Council and, on occasion, to act for it between meetings of the Council.
   (b) to appoint the Executive Director, with the concurrence of at least two-thirds of the members of the Council;
   (c) to determine the necessity of other paid officers and sub-staff;
   (d) to approve the membership of the Committee on Nominations (which is named by the Chairman);
   (e) to make any necessary changes in the terms of reference and membership of other committees;
   (f) to set up special committees as required.

   Membership:
   Eight members: The Chairman of the Council (who shall preside), the Vice-Chairman, the Executive Director (who shall have no vote), the immediate past Chairman (*ex officio*), and four others. The membership of eight shall include at least one from the University of Toronto, one from among the emergent universities, and four from the intermediate sized universities.

2. *Committee on Nominations*
   Task:
   To propose candidates for elective offices and for membership of committees.

   Membership:
   Three members: The Executive Director and two members named by the Chairman of the Council.

3. *Committee on Operating Grants*
   Task:
   (a) To study matters pertaining to the provincial government operating grants system and to make recommendations on these matters to the Council;
   (b) to maintain liaison with the relevant sub-committee of the Ontario Council on University Affairs;
   (c) to undertake such other related tasks as may be assigned to it by the Council.

   Membership:
   Eight members: At least one from a large university, one from a university of intermediate size, and one from a small university.

4. *Committee on Capital Financing*
Task:
(a) To study the problems presented by the planning, construction and financing of university buildings, and to make recommendations on these matters to the Council;
(b) to maintain liaison with the organization of campus planners and physical plant administrators of Ontario universities;
(c) to maintain liaison with appropriate officials of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities;
(d) to undertake such other related tasks as may be assigned to it by the Council.

Membership:
Six members: At least one from a large university, and one from a small university, as well as persons who are familiar with the administrative functions of campus planning and capital financing.

5. *Committee on Information for University Applicants*
Task:
(a) To maintain an overview of the practices of Ontario universities, individually and collectively, in advertising and in communication with prospective and actual undergraduate applicants;
(b) to receive annually from the universities summary information on their activities in these areas, and to evaluate these in the light of the Guidelines and to report on them to COU;
(c) to provide on request advice to the universities concerning the acceptability of proposed new programmes or activities in these areas;
(d) to evaluate without undue delay complaints about violations of the Guidelines submitted to the Committee by any university, school or individual;
(e) to report to COU with recommendations on all cases involving a violation of the Guidelines which remain unresolved between the Committee and the institution involved;
(f) to recommend to COU further clarification and modification of the Guidelines in the light of information received on university practices and comments received from member institutions.

Membership:
Six members: Two university members nominated by the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions and four persons named by COU. The membership is to include a member from the secondary schools and a lay person.

6. *Committee on Teaching and Learning*
Task:
(a) To keep the universities, the Ontario Council on University Affairs, and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities fully informed of current problems, innovations and developments in university teaching and learning;
(b) to select and appoint a Director for the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development;
(c) to distribute funds to universities and faculty members for the improvement of teaching and learning, according to policies and procedures established by the Committee itself;
(d) to offer to universities a resource service which aims to develop a relevant and practical data base for educational innovation;
(e) to be responsible on behalf of the universities of the Province for liaison in instruc-

tional development with organizations in post-secondary education within the Province, outside the Province and outside the country with skill and experience which might benefit the universities of Ontario.

Membership:
Ten members: Six full time faculty members of the universities of Ontario nominated by the universities on a rotational basis and three students drawn from among the names of willing student senators, as well as one or two lay members who might be drawn from the lay membership of Boards of Governors or Senates of Ontario universities. Each member of the Committee is eligible for a three year term of office with at least two members retiring each year.
The Committee is free for any of the purposes assigned to it to coopt to its number up to two persons especially experienced or qualified in the area of instructional development.

7. *Committee on Academic Staff Information*
Task:
(a) To examine further the purpose to be served by each data element proposed for inclusion in the Statistics Canada Master Academic Staff File;
(b) to suggest, if it is considered necessary, a subset of data elements which would be maintained in a central file for system studies;
(c) to propose rules and methods for assuring accessibility to the files for legitimate research and for confidentiality of sensitive information;
(d) to examine mechanisms for implementing and maintaining accessible files which contain certain elements of protected information;
(e) to serve as an official consultative agency to the Council, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and the Ontario Council on University Affairs on request in matters relating to academic staff information;
(f) to serve as a consultative body through which individual universities might seek advice about requests for information on academic staff information.

Membership:
Eight members.

8. *Committee on Enrolment Statistics and Projections*
Task:
(a) To undertake studies of the pattern of enrolment within and among Ontario institutions;
(b) to make projections of enrolment for the Ontario university system;
(c) to aggregate and analyze individual university projections in the light of a review of limits on capacity; and
(d) to serve as a resource on enrolment statistics and projects for individual universities, the Council and concerned government agencies.

Membership:
Six members: Persons with expertise in dealing with enrolment statistics and projections.

9. *Committee on Long-Range Planning*
Task:
(a) To study matters affecting policy planning in Ontario universities individually and collectively; such study to include:
i. changing needs in academic programmes and research,

ii. changing government policies,
iii. changing enrolment patterns,
iv. changing social needs, e.g. needs for highly qualified manpower,
v. the adequacy of current and prospective faculty numbers to meet these needs,
vi. changing levels and sources of financial support.

(b) to recommend to Council strategies for dealing with these developments both in terms of specific actions which might be appropriate for Council to take or in terms of actions which Council might recommend for adoption by individual institutions, OCUA, the Government of Ontario and/or the Government of Canada;

(c) to maintain a continuing review of procedures for planning higher education in Ontario that exist within institutions, COU, OCUA and MCU, to comment on the adequacy of such procedures and, if necessary, to advise Council how such procedures might be improved.

Membership:
Ten members.

10. *Advisory Committee on Academic Planning* (a Committee of the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies)
Task:
(a) To assist the discipline groups in promoting the rationalization of graduate studies within the universities;
(b) to advise OCGS on steps to be taken to implement effective provincial planning of graduate development;
(c) to recommend, through OCGS, to COU the carrying out of planning assessments of disciplines or discipline groups and to recommend suitable arrangements and procedures for each assessment;
(d) to supervise the conduct of each planning assessment approved by COU;
(e) to respond to requests by COU to have a discipline assessment conducted by proposing suitable arrangements;
(f) to submit to COU the reports of the assessments together with any recommendations which the Committee wishes to make.

Membership:
At least seven members: Members of the professoriate in the Ontario universities. The members shall serve for such periods of time as OCGS may determine, and they shall be selected in such manner as may provide a reasonable balance of academic disciplines and of universities. The members of the Committee shall be appointed as individuals.

Special Committees (active)

1. *Special Committee on Visa Student Fees*
Task:
(a) To prepare a position paper on visa student fees;
(b) to monitor the situation as required.

First Report:
Tuition Fees for Foreign Students.

2. *Special Committee on the Support of Bilingualism*
Task:
(a) To draft a COU position paper on the support of bilingualism in Ontario univer-

sities and to develop recommendations on the provincial position in federal-provincial negotiations;

(b) to draft a position paper on the opportunities for English-speaking students in Ontario universities to acquire fluency in the French language and an appreciation of the francophone heritage.

First Report:
Report of the COU Special Committee on the Support of Bilingualism in Ontario Universities (covers Task a).
Rapport du Comité spécial du CUO sur le soutien du bilinguisme dans les universités de l'Ontario.

3. *Special Committee on the Public Image of the Universities*
Task:
(a) To examine activities of individual institutions in dealing with the public perception of the current role of universities;
(b) to identify those areas in which individual institutions and/or COU might expand activities to present the views of the universities on their current role;
(c) to recommend to COU what actions, if any, it might appropriately undertake on behalf of Ontario universities to improve public awareness of their role and importance.

4. *Special Committee on Macro-Indicators*
Task:
To receive and review the output of the Tripartite Committee on Macro-Indicators and to advise COU generally on macro-indicators.

Special Committees (mandate completed during the past three years)

1. *Special Committee on the Anti-Inflation Guidelines*
Task:
(a) To define the problems arising from the implementation of the federal Anti-Inflation Board compliance procedures for universities, propose methods of obtaining solutions, and investigate areas where the Ontario universities might seek common stances;
(b) to prepare an agenda for a proposed seminar on the guidelines for the Ontario universities.

2. *Special Committee on the Interface Study*
Task:
(a) To analyze research reports from the MCU/Ministry of Education Interface Study;
(b) to prepare a draft COU submission on the Interface review, responding to the major questions raised by the Ministries.

Report:
Constructive Partnership: A University Perspective.

3. *Working Group between Deans of Education and the COU Executive Committee*
Task:
To produce a set of proposals for the development of the discipline of education within the universities.

Report:
Realignment of Priorities for Teacher Education: A Status Report on the Ontario Faculties of Education.

Special Joint Committees (active)

1. *Joint Steering Committee on Experimental Achievement Testing*
Task:
(a) To direct the analysis of results of the programme of experimental achievement testing in Ontario universities undertaken in September, 1975;
(b) to designate researchers to be given access to the data, including relevant high school and university records of students to whom the tests were administered (with appropriate safeguards of individual identity);
(c) to determine the form and timing of publication of overall test results and analyses, subject to protecting the anonymity of students and schools, as part of the overall study on the preparation of students for, and admission to, post-secondary education;
(d) to undertake the above tasks in the context of the agreed purposes of COU, MCU, and the Ministry of Education, which are:
1. To use the tests in 1975 on a trial basis and for research purposes;
2. to assess the appropriateness and usefulness of these tests as instruments which might be used further in the research programme of the Joint Ministry of Education/MCU review;
(e) to make arrangements for appropriate financing of the research programme.

Membership:
Eight members: Four members appointed by Council, two members by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, and two members by the Ministry of Education.

2. *Tripartite Committee on Interprovincial Comparisons*
Task:
To obtain reliable information on the levels of support provided for university education in the various provinces.
Membership:
Three members: One member from COU, one from OCUA and one from MCU.

3. *Interim Committee on Architectural Education*
Task:
(a) Development of proposed specific terms of reference for a permanent Architecture Education Board of Ontario acceptable to the relevant parties, in liaison with the Law Reform Commission, the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology, and the Association of Architectural Technologists of Ontario;
(b) preparation of a proposed programme for assumption of responsibilities by the permanent AEBO, and a financial plan, in the light of the comments of the universities and the OAA on the Joint Committee report.

Membership:
Ten members: Four members nominated by the OAA; one nominee from each of the universities involved (Toronto, Ryerson, Waterloo, and Carleton) and non-voting co-chairmen nominated by each parent body (OAA and COU).

4 *Tripartite Committee on Property Tax Reform*
Task:
To study the effects on the universities of proposed changes to the property tax laws; specifically to draw up a comprehensive list of universities' property affected and a categorization of the property to enable the institutions to take advantage of whatever relief may be provided.

Membership:
Three members: One representative each from, MCU, OCUA and COU.

Special Joint Committees (mandate completed)

1. *Joint Committee on Architecture Education*
Task:
(a) To review the positions of COU and the Ontario Association of Architects on the recommendations in the report of the Architecture Study Planning Group;
(b) to develop a proposal for action on the report.

Membership:
Ten members: Five university members of the Architecture Study Planning Group, five appointed by OAA.

Report:
Committee report, April 1977.

2. *Tripartite Committee on Macro-Indicators*
Task:
(a) To establish commonly agreed-upon time series of BIU/FTE faculty and FTE student/FTE faculty ratios for Ontario universities;
(b) to provide some analysis and comments on any deficiencies or lack of comparability in the data over time.

Membership:
Three members: One representative each from MCU, OCUA and COU.
Reports:
Trends in Student-Faculty Ratios in Ontario Universities 1970-71 to 1975-76.
Preliminary Discussion Paper on Macro-Indicators.

Boards for Cooperative Projects

1. *Board for Library Coordination*
Task:
(a) To recommend policy concerning the work of the Office of Library Coordination to the Council;
(b) to recommend to the Council budgets for the carrying out of the work of the Office;
(c) to review and evaluate the progress of the work of the Director of the Office;
(d) to consult regularly with the Ontario Council of University Libraries (and from time to time with such other bodies as may appear to the Board to be helpful) on coordination and cooperation in the development of university library services.

Membership:
Eight to ten members: Two or three chief librarians who are members of the Ontario Council of University Libraries, two or three deans of graduate studies from the On-

tario Council on Graduate Studies; four members of the professoriate of Ontario universities; the Executive Director of COU (*ex officio*).

2 *Board of Management - Application Centre*
Task:
(a) To recommend to COU policy concerning the scope of services to be offered by the Ontario Universities' Application Centre;
(b) to recommend to COU the annual budget of revenue and expenditure for the Application Centre;
(c) to review and evaluate the operation of the Application Centre and report thereon to COU annually;
(d) to approve proposals from the Director on major changes in the internal operation of the Application Centre, and to advise the Director on any other matters which he wishes to bring forward;
(e) to consult regularly with the Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions concerning the services required by this Council for undergraduate applications;
(f) to consult regularly with the Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine concerning the services required by this Council for medical applications;
(g) to consult regularly with the Association of Deans of Education in Ontario Universities concerning the services required by this Association for teacher education applications;
(h) to consult as required with representatives of the secondary schools, appropriate government departments, and other agencies which have an interest in the work of the Centre.

Membership:
Nine members. The membership shall reflect a reasonable balance of the interests of various user groups, and nominations shall be solicited appropriately by COU. The Executive Director of COU shall be a member (*ex officio*).

Affiliates

1. Ontario Universities' Council on Admissions
2. Ontario Council on Graduate Studies
3. Ontario Council of University Libraries
4. Council of Ontario Faculties of Medicine
5. Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering
6. Ontario Council for University Continuing Education
7. Ontario University Registrars' Association
8. Ontario Council of Library Schools
9. Committee of Deans of Ontario Faculties of Law
10. Committee of Finance Officers - Universities of Ontario
11. Council of Deans of Arts and Science of the Ontario Universities
12. Ontario Council of Directors of University Schools of Physical Education
13. Ontario Council of University Health Sciences
14. Ontario Committee on Student Affairs
15. Association of Deans of Education in Ontario Universities
16. Ontario Association of Schools and Departments of Architecture
17. Association of Computer Services Directors
18. Committee of Deans and Directors of Ontario Schools of Social Work
19. Committee of Ontario University Music Administrators
20. Operations Planning and Analysis Group.

Appendix D

Financial Statements

The following tables are condensed summaries of information contained in annual financial statements of C.O.U. Holdings Limited, the company incorporated to manage the business affairs of the Council of Ontario Universities.

C.O.U. Holdings Limited
General Operations
Summary of Income and Expenditures
for the Fiscal Years 1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78

	1975-76	*1976-77*	*1977-78*
INCOME			
University membership subscriptions	$737,795	$815,506	$815,506
Province of Ontario: achievement testing	30,305		
Sundry income	10,890	6,714	23,042
Total income	778,990	822,220	838,548
EXPENDITURES			
Administration and research	427,028	424,526	486,285
Office of Computer Coordination	12,177	6,143	
Office of Library Coordination	36,387	37,488	58,292
Interuniversity Transit System	112,293	118,292	128,483
Ontario Council on Graduate Studies	145,429	89,442	143,680
Affiliate organizations	7,219	7,961	7,541
Special projects	44,436		11,797
Total expenditures	784,969	683,852	836,078
Excess (deficiency) of income over expenditure	(5,979)	138,368	2,470
Surplus (deficit) at beginning of year	30,609	24,630	162,998
Surplus at end of year	$ 24,630	$162,998	$165,468

C.O.U. Holdings Limited — Self-Supp
Summary of Income and Expenditures for the Fiscal Y

	1975-76				197
	Surplus (deficit) at beginning of year	*Income*	*Expenditures*	*Surplus (deficit) end of year*	*Income*
Office of Computer Coordination					
Network	$ 4,236	$ 104,528	$ 112,057	$ (3,293)	$ 136,511
Cooperative Library Interest Group	1,183	—	—	1,183	—
Office of Library Coordination					
Ethnic Newspapers	5,271	—	—	5,271	—
UNICAT/TELECAT (Union Catalogue Project)	(9,192)	698,745	639,168	50,385	858,086
Interuniversity Borrowing Project	(228)	797	1,164	(595)	1,364
CODOC (Cooperative Documents Project)	3,309	53,513	58,534	(1,712)	68,954
CUSS (Cooperative Union Serials System)	217	330	1,377	(830)	3,227
MAP Project (Atlases Union List)	—	1,061	3,101	(2,040)	925
MEDICAT (Medical Catalogue Project)	—	—	—	—	—
Ontario Universities' Application Centre					
Undergraduate Application Service	(30,881)	518,987	416,092	72,014	520,396
Ontario Medical Schools Application Service	4,824	103,601	108,150	275	107,585
Program for Instructional Development	(16)	15,588	14,920	652	1,054
Architectural Study Planning Group	2,586	57	12,150	(9,507)	—
Canadian Association of Graduate Schools	344	5,843	5,725	462	6,865
Appraisals Committee	(20,269)	64,114	50,120	(6,275)	71,524
Health Sciences	—	—	—	—	—
Accounting Principles	—	—	—	—	—
	$(38,616)	$1,567,164	$1,422,558	$105,990	$1,776,491

*Transfer of deficit to general operations.

dings Limited — Self-Supporting Activities
penditures for the Fiscal Years 1975-76, 1976-77, 1977-78

nditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year	1976-77 Income	1976-77 Expenditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year	1977-78 Income	1977-78 Expenditures	Surplus (deficit) end of year
12,057	$ (3,293)	$ 136,511	$ 135,900	$ (2,682)	$ 30,441	$ 31,111	$ (3,352)
—	1,183	—	—	1,183	—	—	1,183
—	5,271	—	—	5,271	—	—	5,271
39,168	50,385	858,086	864,993	43,478	1,105,022	1,087,597	60,903
1,164	(595)	1,364	1,514	(745)	1,519	1,643	(869)
58,534	(1,712)	68,954	71,184	(3,942)	73,778	81,628	(11,792)
1,377	(830)	3,227	2,824	(427)	3,405	3,410	(432)
3,101	(2,040)	925	195	(1,310)	366	130	(1,074)
—	—	—	—	—	12,375	10,326	2,049
16,092	72,014	520,396	448,429	143,981	476,331	456,924	163,388
08,150	275	107,585	105,220	2,640	113,328	101,849	14,119
14,920	652	1,054	1,054	652	501,836	422,995	79,493
12,150	(9,507)	—	2,017	(11,524)	11,797*	273	—
5,725	462	6,865	4,732	2,595	6,947	9,807	(265)
60,120	(6,275)	71,524	59,385	5,864	51,373	82,183	(24,946)
—	—	—	—	—	4,000	4,423	(423)
—	—	—	—	—	4,373	4,294	79
22,558	$105,990	$1,776,491	$1,697,447	$185,034	$2,396,891	$2,298,593	$283,332

Appendix E

Publications of the Council of Ontario Universities and its Affiliates

Listed here are all publications released since the last *Review*, except for those which have been superseded, and a selection of publications from earlier years deemed to be still of general interest.

Number	*Title*	*Price*
	Previous Reviews	
67-1	System Emerging: First Annual Review (1967) 59 pp.	Gratis
68-1	Collective Autonomy: Second Annual Review (1968) 65 pp.	Gratis
69-1	Campus and Forum: Third Annual Review (1969) 73 pp.	Gratis
70-5	Variations on a Theme: Fourth Annual Review (1970) 77 pp.	Gratis
71-15	Participatory Planning: Fifth Annual Review (1971) 90 pp.	Gratis
72-18	Stimulus and Response: Sixth Annual Review (1972) 80 pp.	Gratis
76-1	New Structure, New Environment: Review 1972-73 to 1974-75 (1976) 78 pp.	Gratis
	Other Publications	
62-1	Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962-70 (1962) 44 pp.	$ 1.00
63-1	The Structure of Post-Secondary Education in Ontario (1963) 30 pp.	$ 1.50
66-1	From the Sixties to the Seventies: An Appraisal of Higher Education in Ontario (1966) 101 pp.	$ 2.00
70-4	Ring of Iron: A Study of Engineering Education in Ontario (1970) 154 pp.	$ 2.00
70-19	Television and Technology in University Teaching (1970) 84 pp.	Gratis
71-7	Financing University Programs in Education (1971) 76 pp.	Gratis
71-9P	Towards 2000 (published by McClelland and Stewart) (1971) 176 pp.	$ 2.95
71-10	Accessibility and Student Aid (1971) 150 pp.	$ 2.50
71-13	Statement by the Council of Ontario Universities and Responses by Committee of Ontario Deans of Engineering, Ontario Council on Graduate Studies, Association of Professional Engineers of Ontario to *Ring of Iron: A Study of Engineering Education in Ontario* (1971) 98 pp.	$ 1.00
72-7	Responses to the *Draft Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario* (1972) 45 pp.	Gratis
72-8	"The Ten O'Clock Scholar?" What a Professor Does for his Pay (1972) 14 pp.	Gratis

Number	*Title*	*Price*
72-9	Building Blocks: Background Studies on the Development of a Capital Formula for Ontario Vol. I: Report of the Task Force - Space and Utilization (1972) 186 pp.	$ 6.00
72-10	Building Blocks: Vol. III: Report of the Task Force - Space for Health Sciences (1972) 72 pp.	$ 3.00
72-11	Building Blocks: Vol. II: Report of the Task Force - Space for Education (1972) 48 pp.	$ 2.00
72-12	Building Blocks: Vol. IV: Report of the Task Force - Building Costs (1972) 86 pp.	$ 3.00
73-1	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. I. Library Science 1972 (1973) 169 pp.	$ 5.00
73-4	Response to the Report of the Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario (1973) 28 pp.	Gratis
74-1	Building Blocks: Vol. V: Report of the Task Force - Building Life Costs (1974) 144 pp.	$ 5.00
74-2	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 2. Education 1973 (1974) 179 pp.	$ 5.00
74-3	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 3. Economics 1973 (1974) 197 pp.	$ 5.00
74-4	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 4. Geography 1973 (1974) 131 pp.	$ 5.00
74-5	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 5. Chemistry 1973 (1974) 168 pp.	$ 5.00
74-6	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 6. Solid Earth Science 1973 (1974) 161 pp.	$ 5.00
74-8	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 7. Sociology 1973 (1974) 215 pp.	$ 5.00
74-9	The Ontario Operating Grants Formula: A Statement of Principles to the Ontario Council on University Affairs (1974) 51 pp.	Gratis
74-10	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 8. Anthropology 1974 (1974) 71 pp.	$ 3.00
74-11	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 9. Political Science 1974 (1974) 269 pp.	$ 5.00
74-12	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 10. Physical Education, Kinesiology, and Related Areas 1974 (1974) 160 pp.	$ 5.00
74-13	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11A. Chemical Engineering 1974 (1974) 221 pp.	$ 5.00
74-14	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11B. Electrical Engineering 1974 (1974) 259 pp.	$ 5.00
74-15	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11C. Metallurgical and Materials Engineering 1974 (1974) 213 pp.	$ 5.00

Number	Title	Price
74-16	Ontario Universities' Application Centre: The First Three Years 1971-74 (1974) 47 pp.	Gratis
74-21	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11D. Mechanical Engineering 1974 (1974) 133 pp.	$ 5.00
74-22	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11E. Industrial Engineering and Systems Design 1974 (1974) 152 pp.	$ 5.00
74-23	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 12. Religious Studies 1974 (1974) 106 pp.	$ 5.00
74-24	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 13. Planning and Environmental Studies 1974 (1974) 144 pp.	$ 5.00
75-1	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 14. Physics and Astronomy 1974 (1975) 224 pp.	$ 5.00
75-2	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 15. History 1974 (1975) 208 pp.	$ 5.00
75-5	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 16. Biophysics 1974 (1975) 47 pp.	$ 3.00
75-6	The Status of Women in the Ontario Universities (1975) 20 pp.	$ 2.00
75-10	Teaching and Learning: An Evaluation of the Ontario Universities Program for Instructional Development (1975) 89 pp.	$ 3.50
75-11	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 11F. Civil Engineering 1974/75 (1975) 304 pp.	$ 8.00
75-12	Post-Doctoral Education in the Ontario Universities (1975) 63 pp.	$ 2.00
75-13	UNICAT/TELECAT: A Report of the Cooperative Use of a Computer-Based Cataloguing Support System (1975) 202 pp.	$10.00
76-2	Preliminary Budget Forecasts for Provincially Assisted Universities of Ontario for the Fiscal Year ended April 30, 1976 (1976) 70 pp. (Published annually from 1972-73)	$ 3.00
76-4	Report from the Special Committee to Assess University Policies and Plans (1976) 31 pp.	Gratis
76-5	Brief to the Canadian and Ontario Governments on the Financing of Higher Education in Canada (1976) 24 pp.	Gratis
76-7	Proceedings of the Workshop on Instructional Development held at Wilfrid Laurier University (1976) 56 pp.	Gratis
76-8	Graduate Planning in Ontario Universities. Brief to OCUA (1976) 73 pp.	Gratis
76-9	Approach to the Eighties: Demand/Quality/Resources. Brief to OCUA (1976) 59 pp.	Gratis
76-10	Statement on the Principles which should govern the setting of Tuition Fees (1976) 12 pp.	Gratis
76-12	Application Statistics 1974 (1976) 43 pp. (Published annually from 1973)	Gratis

Number	*Title*	*Price*
76-13	Academic Career Planning: The Ivory Tower and the Crystal Ball. Report of the Joint COU/OCUFA Committee on the Study of Academic Career Development in Ontario Universities (1976) 42 pp.	$ 3.00
76-14	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 17. Administration, Business and Management Science 1974 (1976) 143 pp.	$ 5.00
76-15	Commoditie, Firmenes and Delight: A Study of Architectural Education in Ontario (1976) 352 pp.	$10.00
76-16	Report on Workshop for University Teachers held at the University of Guelph (1976) 50 pp.	Gratis
76-17	Graduate Student Incomes in Ontario 1974-75 (1976) 35 pp. (Published annually from 1972-73)	Gratis
76-18	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 18. Fine Arts 1974-76 (1976) 204 pp.	$ 5.00
76-19	Total Revenue and Expenses for Provincially Assisted Universities of Ontario for the Fiscal Year ended April 30, 1976 (1976) 92 pp. (Published annually from 1970-71)	$ 3.00
77-1	Foundation for an Uncertain Future: The Operating Base. Brief to OCUA (1977) 54 pp.	Gratis
77-2	Foundation for an Uncertain Future: The Capital Base. Brief to OCUA (1977) 22 pp.	Gratis
77-3	Tuition Fees for Foreign Students. Brief to OCUA (1977) 7 pp.	Gratis
77-4	Graduate Planning in Ontario Universities: Objectives - Funding - Monitoring. Brief to OCUA (1977) 27 pp.	Gratis
77-5	Constructive Partnership: A University Perspective. The Report from the Special Committee on the Interface Study (1977) 60 pp.	Gratis
77-6	Perspectives and Plans for Graduate Studies: Vol. 19. Mathematical Sciences 1975 (1977) 196 pp.	$ 5.00
77-7	Total Revenue and Expenses for Provincially Assisted Universities of Ontario for the Fiscal Year ended April 30, 1977 (1978) 119 pp.	$10.00
77-8	Guide to Accounting Principles, Practices and Standards of Disclosure for Colleges and Universities of Ontario (1977) 41 pp. (Supplements and revisions are published periodically)	$20.00 ($10.00 for subsequent annual subscription)
78-1	The Price of Restraint. Brief to OCUA (1978) 61 pp.	Gratis
78-2	Realignment of Priorities for Teacher Education: A Status Report on the Ontario Faculties of Education (1978) 57 pp.	Gratis
78-3	Ontario University Non-Salary Price Index (1978) 20 pp.	$ 3.00

Number	*Title*	*Price*
78-4	Applications to Ontario Law Schools 1973 and 1974. Report of a Study of Ontario Law Schools Admissions Policies and Practices (1978) 47 pp.	$ 3.00
78-5	The Ontario Universities Library Cooperative System: Handbook and Organization Guide (1978) 41 pp.	Gratis
78-6	Graduate Planning in Ontario Universities. Brief to OCUA (1978) 36 pp.	Gratis
78-7	Graduate Student Incomes in Ontario, 1975-76 (1978) 34 pp.	Gratis
78-8	Graduate Student Incomes in Ontario, 1976-77 (1978) 30 pp.	Gratis
78-9	Report of a Study of Ontario Medical School Admissions Policies and Practices, 1975 (1978) 67 pp.	$ 3.00
78-10	Map Sources Directory (1978) 109 pp.	$10.00
78-11	Total Revenue and Expenses for Provincially Assisted Universities of Ontario for the Fiscal Year ended April 30, 1978 (1978) 119 pp.	$10.00
78-12	Building Blocks: Vol. VI: Report of the Subcommittee - Revisions to Building Blocks (1978) 122 pp.	$ 5.00
78-13	Application Statistics 1975 (1978) 21 pp.	Gratis
78-14	Application Statistics 1976 (1978) 21 pp.	Gratis
78-15	Application Statistics 1977 (1978) 21 pp.	Gratis
78-16	An Approach to the Funding of Continuing Education for Teachers. A Supplement to: *Realignment of Priorities for Teacher Education* (1978) 17 pp.	Gratis